



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

385.374

M15



REPORT
OF THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND

FOR THE YEAR 1918

BALTIMORE
KOHN & POLLOCK, INC.
1919

LIBRARY

COMMISSION

ALBERT G. TOWERS, *Chairman,*

JNO. MILTON REIFSNIDER,

JAMES C. LEGG.

BENJAMIN T. FENDALL,
Secretary.

WILLIAM CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

JOSEPH S. GOLDSMITH,
Assistant General Counsel.

260415

YRAX 207MAY2

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Report of Commission.....	1-8
Report of Secretary.....	9-11
Report of General Counsel.....	11-13
Report of Assistant General Counsel.....	13-16
Report of Chief Engineer.....	16-19
Report of Transportation Expert.....	19-22
Report of Rate Clerk.....	22-24
Report of Auditor.....	24-26

APPENDIX I.

Statement of Salaries and Expenses.....	27-30
---	-------

APPENDIX II.

Opinions and Orders of Commission.....	31-429
--	--------

APPENDIX III.

Opinions of General Counsel.....	431-476
----------------------------------	---------

APPENDIX IV.

Summaries of Gas and Electric Meter Tests.....	478-481
Summary of Gas Tests and Analyses.....	482-485
Summary of Water Meter Tests.....	484
Interruptions to Power Supply.....	486
Summary of Accidents—Personal Accidents, Transportation and Utilities Companies, 1917.....	487-502

APPENDIX V.

STATISTICS FROM ANNUAL REPORTS OF CORPORATIONS.

Preliminary Statement.....	503
Fragmentary Reports.....	505-507
Corporations Not Reporting.....	508
Alphabetical List of Corporations Reporting.....	510-513
Key to Marginal Numbers in List.....	514

TABLES.

TABLE No. 1.—Showing for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Amounts of Assets, of Liabilities and of Surplus, on December 31, 1917, and the Total Amount of Gross Revenue, the Deductions from Gross Revenue and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Increases or Decreases from the Preceding Year.....	516-517
---	---------

TABLE No. 2.—Showing for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Amounts of Assets on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets.....	518-521
--	---------

TABLE No. 3.—Showing for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Amount of Liabilities on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Liabilities.....	522-525
--	---------

TABLE No. 4.—Showing in Detail for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Funded Debt and Capital Stock Securities Outstanding on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of the Same.....	526-527
---	---------

	PAGE
TABLE No. 5.—Showing for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Funded Debt and Capital Stock Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Such Funded Debt and Capital Stock as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), the Rate Per Cent. and Dates of Payment of Interest on Funded Debt and the Rate Per Cent. and Amount of Dividends Declared on Capital Stock.	528-531
TABLE No. 6.—Showing for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Cost of Road and Equipment, and the Distribution of Same on December 31, 1917, and the Average Investment in Road and Equipment Per Mile of Road Owned.....	532-533
TABLE No. 7.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Income Account for the Year, and the Profit and Loss Account on December 31, 1917.....	534-537
TABLE No. 8.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Revenue from Rail Operations and the Classification Thereof, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	538-541
TABLE No. 9.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Expenses from Operating and the Classification Thereof, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	542-547
TABLE No. 10.—Showing for Each of the Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein, Both for the System as a Whole and for That Part Within the State of Maryland, the Number of Miles Owned and Operated on December 31, 1917....	548-551
TABLE No. 11.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein its Locomotive and Car Equipment on December 31, 1917, with the Classification of the Same.....	552-553
TABLE No. 12.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein Various Statistical Items Concerning the Rail Operations of the Road, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	554-555
TABLE No. 13.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein Various Statistical Items Concerning the Rail Operations of the Road, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	556-557
TABLE No. 14.—Showing for Each of the Operating Steam Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Revenue Freight Carried During the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Classification of the Same.....	558-559
TABLE No. 15.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Amounts of Assets, of Liabilities and of Surplus, on December 31, 1917, and the Total Amount of Gross Income, the Deductions from Gross Income and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Increases or Decreases from the Preceding Year.....	561
TABLE No. 16.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Assets and the Deficit on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets.....	562-565
TABLE No. 17.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Liabilities and the Surplus on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Liabilities.....	566-569
TABLE No. 18.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Amount of All Classes of Securities Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Any Such as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), and a Classification of These Securities Between Funded Debt and Stocks.....	570-571

CONTENTS

v

PAGE

TABLE No. 19.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Funded Debt and Capital Stock Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Such Funded Debt and Capital Stock as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), Description of Same, Rate Per Cent., the Amount of Interest Accruing on Funded Debt and the Amount of Dividends Declared on Capital Stock During the Year.....	572-573
TABLE No. 20.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Investment in Road and Equipment on December 31, 1917.....	575
TABLE No. 21.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Income and the Profit and Loss Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	576-579
TABLE No. 22.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Operating Revenues for the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Distribution Thereof.....	580-581
TABLE No. 23.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Total Operating Expenses for the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Distribution Thereof.....	582-585
TABLE No. 24.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein the Equipment in Service and the Number of Miles of Road Operated on December 31, 1917.....	586-587
TABLE No. 25.—Showing for Each of the Electric Railroad Corporations Named Therein Mileage, Traffic and Miscellaneous Statistics for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Asterisk (*) Denotes Absence of Required Figures.....	588-589
TABLE No. 26.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein the Total Amounts of Assets, of Liabilities and of Surplus, on December 31, 1917, and the Total Amount of Gross Income, the Deductions from Gross Income and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Increases or Decreases from the Preceding Year.....	591
TABLE No. 27.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Assets, the Total Amount of Liabilities and the Surplus on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets and Liabilities.....	592-593
TABLE No. 28.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein the Gross Income from All Sources, the Deductions from Gross Income, the Net Income, the Appropriations from Net Income and the Surplus from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	594-595
TABLE No. 29.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein the Total Funded Debt and Capital Stock Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Such Funded Debt and Capital Stock as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), the Rate Per Cent. and Dates of Payment of Interest on Funded Debt, and the Rate Per Cent. and Amount of Dividends Declared on Capital Stock...	596
TABLE No. 30.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein Various Operating Statistics for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Characters Shown in This Table Indicate as Follows: 0—None; *—Absence of Required Figures.....	597
TABLE No. 31.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein Various Operating Statistics for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Characters Shown in This Table Indicate as Follows: 0—None; *—Absence of Required Figures.....	598

TABLE No. 32.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light Corporations Named Therein the Casualties, Classified as to Employees and Others, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: 0—None.....	599
TABLE No. 33.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light and Gas Corporations Named Therein the Total Amounts of Assets, of Liabilities and of Surplus, on December 31, 1917, and the Total Amount of Gross Income, the Deductions from Gross Income and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Increases or Decreases from the Preceding Year....	601
TABLE No. 34.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light and Gas Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Assets, the Total Amount of Liabilities and the Surplus on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets and Liabilities.....	602-603
TABLE No. 35.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light and Gas Corporations Named Therein the Amount of Gross Income from All Sources, the Deductions from Gross Income, the Net Income, the Appropriations from Net Income and the Surplus from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	604-605
TABLE No. 36.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light and Gas Corporations Named Therein the Total Funded Debt and Capital Stock Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Such Funded Debt and Capital Stock as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), the Rate Per Cent. and Dates of Payment of Interest on Funded Debt, and the Rate Per Cent. and Amount of Dividends Declared on Capital Stock.....	607
TABLE No. 37.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light and Gas Corporations Named Therein Various Operating Statistics for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Characters Shown in This Table Indicate as Follows: 0—None; *—Absence of Required Figures.....	608-609
TABLE No. 38.—Showing for Each of the Electric Light and Gas Corporations Named Therein the Casualties Occurring During the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: 0—None.....	610
TABLE No. 39.—Showing for Each of the Water Corporations Named Therein the Total Amounts of Assets, of Liabilities and of Surplus, on December 31, 1917, and the Total Amount of Gross Income, the Deductions from Gross Income and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: *—Absence of Required Figures.....	611
TABLE No. 40.—Showing for Each of the Water Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Assets, the Total Amount of Liabilities, the Total Amount of Surplus on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets and Liabilities. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: *—Absence of Required Figures.....	612-613
TABLE No. 41.—Showing for Each of the Water Corporations Named Therein the Gross Income from All Sources, the Deductions from Gross Income, the Net Income, the Appropriations from Net Income and the Surplus from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Characters Shown in This Table Indicate as Follows: 0—None; *—Absence of Required Figures.....	614-615
TABLE No. 42.—Showing for Each of the Water Corporations Named Therein the Total Funded Debt and Capital Stock Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Such Funded Debt and Capital Stock as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), the Rate Per Cent. and Dates of Payment of Interest on Funded Debt, and the Rate Per Cent. and Amount of Dividends Declared on Capital Stock.....	617

CONTENTS

vii

PAGE

TABLE No. 43.—Showing for Each of the Water Corporations Named Therein Various Statistics Relating to the Supply and Service of the Same, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Characters Shown in This Table Indicate as Follows: 0—None; *—Absence of Required Figures618-619

TABLE No. 44.—Showing for Each of the Water Corporations Named Therein the Casualties, Classified as to Employees and Others, Occurring During the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: 0—None.620

TABLE No. 45.—Showing for Each of the Telephone and Telegraph Corporations Named Therein the Total Amounts of Assets, of Liabilities and of Surplus, on December 31, 1917, and the Total Amount of Gross Income, the Deductions from Gross Income and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Increases or Decreases from the Preceding Year.621

TABLE No. 46.—Showing for Each of the Telephone and Telegraph Corporations Named Therein the Total Amount of Assets, the Total Amount of Liabilities and the Surplus on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets and Liabilities.622-623

TABLE No. 47.—Showing for Each of the Telephone and Telegraph Corporations Named Therein the Gross Income from All Sources, the Deductions from Gross Income, the Net Income, the Appropriations from Net Income and the Surplus from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917.624-625

TABLE No. 48.—Showing for Each of the Telephone and Telegraph Corporations Named Therein the Total Funded Debt and Capital Stock Outstanding on December 31, 1917 (Exclusive of Such Funded Debt and Capital Stock as are Held by the Issuing Corporation), the Rate Per Cent. and Dates of Payment of Interest on Funded Debt and the Rate Per Cent. and Amount of Dividends Declared on Capital Stock.627

TABLE No. 49.—Showing for Each of the Telephone and Telegraph Corporations Named Therein Various Operating Statistics for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: 0—None. . . .628-629

TABLE No. 50.—Showing for Each of the Telephone and Telegraph Corporations Named Therein the Casualties, Classified as to Employees and Others, for the Year Ended December 31, 1917. The Character Shown in This Table Indicates as Follows: 0—None.631

TABLE No. 51.—Showing for Each of the Express Corporations Named Therein the Amount of Assets on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets. .632-633

TABLE No. 52.—Showing for Each of the Express Corporations Named Therein the Amount of Liabilities on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Liabilities.634-635

TABLE No. 53.—Showing for Each of the Express Corporations Named Therein the Income Account for the Year and the Profit and Loss Account on December 31, 1917.636-637

TABLE No. 54.—Showing for Each of the Express Corporations Named Therein the Operating Revenue for the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Distribution Thereof.638-639

TABLE No. 55.—Showing for Each of the Express Corporations Named Therein the Operating Expenses for the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Distribution Thereof.640-641

	Page
TABLE No. 56.—The Pullman Company. Comparative General Balance Sheet— December 31, 1917.....	642
TABLE No. 57.—The Pullman Company. Showing the Income Account for the Year and the Profit and Loss Account on December 31, 1917.....	643
TABLE No. 58.—The Pullman Company. Showing the Operating Revenues and the Auxiliary Revenues and Expenses for the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	644
TABLE No. 59.—The Pullman Company. Showing the Operating Expenses for the Year Ended December 31, 1917, and the Distribution Thereof	645
TABLE No. 60.—The Pullman Company. Showing Certain Statistics and Operating Revenue and Expense Averages and Comparisons.....	647
TABLE No. 61.—Showing for Each of the Corporations Named Therein the Amount of Assets, the Amount of Liabilities and the Surplus on December 31, 1917, and the Classification of Such Assets and Liabilities.....	648-649
TABLE No. 62.—Showing for Each of the Corporations Named Therein the Gross Income from All Sources, the Deductions from Income and the Net Income from the Operations of the Year Ended December 31, 1917.....	650-651

REPORT
OF THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND

For the Year Ended December 31, 1918

STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1918.

Hon. Emerson C. Harrington,
Governor of Maryland,
Annapolis, Md.

SIR:

Report of the Public Service Commission for the year ending December 31, 1918, is herewith respectfully submitted, as required by the Act creating said Commission.

CHANGES IN ORGANIZATION

Upon the expiration of the term of Mr. E. Clay Timanus, Commissioner, Mr. James C. Legg was appointed to fill the vacancy. Mr. Legg qualified on July 15, 1918, and at once took up the duties of the office. Mr. Timanus' wide acquaintance, together with his clear knowledge of the business affairs and needs of the State, served to make him a valuable member of the Commission, and his uniform geniality and consideration operated to endear him to the entire personnel of the Commission.

On October 1, 1918, Mr. Osborne I. Yellott resigned as Assistant General Counsel of the Commission, which office he had filled since February 17, 1913. By both temperament and training Mr. Yellott was eminently qualified to perform the manifold duties which devolved upon him by reason of his office, and as he was also an indefatigable worker his loss was keenly felt by the Commission. Mr. Yellott was retained by the Commission as special counsel in the complaint of the Public Service Commission vs. The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, Case No. 1583, involving the reasonableness of the increase of one cent in all fares inaugurated by the railways company on October 1, 1918, hearings in which case were started on November 18 and arguments therein concluded on December 19. Mr. Joseph S. Goldsmith was appointed by the General Counsel of the Commission to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Yellott's resignation and took the oath of office on October 7, 1918.

Mr. Charles E. Phelps, Jr., who had been Chief Engineer of the Commission since shortly after its organization, recently tendered his resignation to the Commission and same was accepted by the Commission, with regret, to become effective the first of January. Before Mr. Phelps' resignation had become effective he was taken ill and died on December 23. During his more than eight years' service with the Commission Mr. Phelps carried on much important work for the Commission, particularly in connection with numerous valuation proceedings, and his professional ability and integrity were always of the highest order. The Commission has not yet appointed Mr. Phelps' successor.

During the year four employees of the Commission have resigned in order to enter the military and naval service of the nation, making in all six former employees of the Commission so engaged at the present time.

GENERAL WORK OF THE COMMISSION

During the year 1918 a large number of questions have been presented to the Commission for adjudication.

Cases were docketed during the year as follows:

Formal Docket.....	166
Correspondence Docket.....	...
Short Notice and Reparation Docket.....	73
	<hr/>
Total.....	239
Petty Complaints satisfied but not docketed...	576
	<hr/>
Grand Total.....	815

Including cases entered in previous year and remaining open on the Commission's docket on January 1, 1918, 225 cases were closed during the year.

The changing of economic conditions throughout the country has had the natural effect of largely increasing the work of the Commission. The increased expenses of operation have been encountered by practically every utility in the State, a large number of which utilities have increased the rates at which they sell the particular commodity or service dealt in to offset the increased cost of operation and to insure their ability to render satisfactory service to their patrons.

CORPORATIONS UNDER JURISDICTION

The following table shows the number of corporations other than automobile transportation companies over which the Commission exercises jurisdiction, with their capitalization and other information:

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

CORPORATIONS UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION.

CLASS.	NUMBER UNDER JURISDICTION.	NUMBER REPORTING.	INCOMPLETE REPORTS.	NOT REPORTING.	CAPITAL STOCK.	FUNDED DEBT.	TOTAL CAPITALIZATION.	INTEREST ACCRUED ON FUNDED DEBT.	DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON CAPITAL STOCK.
.....	5	5	\$51,216,400	\$20,736,500	\$71,952,900	\$871,988	\$3,834,234
.....	44	30	5	9	12,154,048	14,703,800	26,857,848	718,718	793,745
".....	5	4	1	14,744,040	38,243,990	52,988,030	1,789,345	1,251,571
.....	14	13	1	2,621,480	5,664,000	8,285,480	170,860	82,340
".....	24	18	2	4	59,436,310	100,612,178	160,048,488	4,356,170	2,537,278
.....	29	26	1	2	519,697,887	713,914,963	1,233,612,850	26,785,018	26,695,054
.....	9	7	2	1,276,100	8,000	1,284,100	400	27,737
.....	35	20	7	8	2,419,352	1,975,800	4,395,152	87,844	37,897
.....	2	2	110,000	0	110,000	0	0
.....	14	8	2	4	1,205,245	2,300	1,207,545	123	250
.....	2	1	1	1,969,400	449,000	2,418,400	18,237	25,000
Miscellaneous Companies.....	1	1	117,103,500	0	117,103,500	0	9,543,983
Sleeping Car Company (Pullman Company).....
Totals.....	184	136	21	28	\$783,953,762	\$896,310,531	\$1,690,264,293	\$34,798,703	\$44,829,099

AMENDMENTS OF THE LAW

At the January Session of 1918 of the General Assembly of Maryland several Acts were enacted, which changed in certain particulars the Public Service Commission Law, none of which, however, change any of the fundamental provisions of the original Act. Chapters 199 and 304 deal with the license fees and operation of motor vehicles for public use, Chapter 402 requires corporations under the jurisdiction of the Commission to make reports for the calendar year instead of the year ending June 30, as formerly required, and Chapter 408 is in relation to issuance of stocks, bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness by common carriers and gas and electrical corporations.

Several other amendments prepared by the Commission with the idea of strengthening the law were submitted to the General Assembly but were defeated.

IMPORTANT CASES

On November 19, 1917, John J. Carlin, operating a central community heating plant in the northwestern section of Baltimore City, filed with the Commission schedule increasing the rates for steam heating service something over 100 per cent. Shortly thereafter, the Commission upon its own motion and in order to determine the reasonableness of the proposed changes, docketed Case No. 1440 and immediately entered into an investigation of the matter, which necessitated the making by the Commission of a physical inventory and valuation of the heating plant. Hearings extending over a period of four days were conducted by the Commission and on April 22, 1918, the Commission filed its opinion and entered its order requiring certain reductions in the rates proposed by Mr. Carlin. The rates established by the Commission were designed to yield a sum equal to the actual cost of operation of the plant, with a reasonable allowance for depreciation that same is undergoing but excluding any return upon the investment.

On May 27, 1918, the Commission filed its opinion and entered its order in the matter of the complaint of the Mayor and City Council of Salisbury vs. Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company, Case No. 1174, which case brought into question the reasonableness of the rates charged by the respondent company for electrical energy supplied by it for lighting and power uses in the town of Salisbury. The Commission in this case finding that the earnings of the respondent company upon its investment accruing under its existing schedules of rates were not excessive and that the rates were not unreasonable *per se*, the complaint was accordingly dismissed. This case involved a valuation of the property of the respondent company, which valuation was made by the Engineering Department of the Commission.

On November 28, 1917, the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore filed with the Commission certain amendments to its electric rate schedule designed to become effective

on January 1, 1918, effecting changes in the company's industrial power rates in several respects, the most important change being the addition of a "Fuel Rate Adjustment Clause" by which the net price for each kilowatt hour for electric energy is made subject each month to increase or decrease, according to the average cost of coal delivered to the company's bunkers during that month. In order to determine the reasonableness of the additional charges proposed by the electric company the Commission on its own motion docketed Case No. 1492 and entered into an investigation of the matter. Hearings before the Commission occupied seventeen days, in addition to which four days were given over to oral argument. The Commission by order entered on the 9th day of August, 1918, held the fuel rate adjustment clause, as proposed by the company, was neither unjust nor unreasonable, though certain of the other changes proposed by the Company were disapproved. The fuel rate adjustment clause is not applied to domestic consumers or other small users of current, the rates charged these customers remaining unchanged.

This company on April 4, 1918, petitioned the Commission for permission to increase the price charged for gas sold by it, the increase sought being 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in the case of the primary rates and 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in case of the secondary rates. After hearings and arguments occupying fifteen days, the Commission on November 25 filed its opinion and entered its order whereby it permitted the Consolidated Company to increase, effective December 1, 1918, its secondary rates 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, as prayed for, but denied the increase sought by the company in its primary rates. The Commission at the same time reduced the required standard to be maintained by this company from 600 b. t. u. monthly average, as established by the Commission's order entered on April 17, 1915, in Case No. 837, to 550 b. t. u. monthly average. In point of fact, for about a year past the company has been unable to maintain in its product the heating value earlier prescribed by the Commission, due to its inability to secure the necessary amount of oil required to enrich its gas to the point prescribed by the Commission, and the action of the Commission therefore merely had the effect of legalizing the standard which the company had of necessity been compelled to adopt by the necessities of the conditions resulting from the world war. The Commission in this case purposely made its order of such a nature that it is reviewable at comparatively short intervals, so that if necessary the situation can be quickly remedied so as to avoid hardship to either the company or its patrons, should changing conditions during the period of adjustment following the war demand a modification of the order aforesaid.

On June 4, 1918, the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company and the Maryland Electric Railways Company petitioned the Commission for permission to make certain changes in their respective tariff schedules on less than statutory notice. The effect of the changes, if permitted, would have been to establish a base

fare of 3 cents per mile in lieu of the one-way and round-trip fares theretofore published by the two carriers, and commutation fares would have been increased 10 per cent. The Director of the Division of Traffic, United States Railroad Administration, wrote to the Commission requesting that the necessary permission to effect these changes be granted by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, but after full investigation the Commission found that the revenues of the two applicant companies were sufficient under the existing rates to adequately provide for the corporations' requirements and the Commission consequently filed its order on June 19 denying the application. One of the companies subsequently appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to increase its interstate rates and fares to the basis proposed in the application before this Commission and it is interesting to note that this application was also denied by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

On July 6, 1917, the Commission entered its Order No. 3751 in Case No. 375 establishing the fair value of the property of the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company as of December 31, 1916, and fixing 7 per cent. as the maximum rate of return to be permitted upon such valuation. On November 20, 1917, the company filed with the Commission a rate schedule designed to yield a return upon the property of the water company of 7 per cent., the new schedule being intended to become effective on January 1, 1918, in certain districts and on July 1, 1918, in other districts, the effective date being subsequently postponed by voluntary agreement of the company until April 1, 1918. Numerous protests against the new rates were received by the Commission and subsequently the matter was set for hearing before the Commission. During the course of the hearings some criticism was offered by various protestants respecting the reasonableness of the valuation established by the Commission and certain independent consulting engineers were employed to review the valuation proceedings of the Commission and to report upon the reasonableness of the rates proposed by the Company. Subsequent to the filing of the reports of the Commission's experts and after hearings at which the protestants were afforded every opportunity to be heard, the Commission on July 25, 1918, filed its opinion and entered its order establishing just and reasonable rates to be thereafter charged and collected by the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company. Certain of the protestants took appeal from the Commission's decision to the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, but the appeals were subsequently dismissed by the several appellants.

At various times in the past the failure of the water supply of the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company in different sections of the territory served by it has been the cause of considerable hardship and inconvenience, not to say danger, to the communities so affected, as well as a matter of grave concern to the Commission. In the early summer of the present year such a shortage occurred at Towson, Lutherville and other nearby sections and on July 23, 1918,

Osborne I. Yellott, Esq., Assistant General Counsel of the Commission and a patron of the water company, filed a complaint with the Commission on behalf of himself and the other patrons of the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company affected by the shortage. The Commission thoroughly went into the question with the idea of permanently remedying the situation in this respect and preventing similar occurrences in the future so far as it lay in its power to do so. On August 19, 1918, the Commissioner before whom the case was heard filed his findings of fact and recommendations and shortly thereafter the Commission entered its order requiring further changes in and additions to the plant of the water company which it is earnestly believed will remedy the situation.

On July 24, 1918, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore petitioned the Commission for permission to increase the one-way and commutation fares of said company, the increase being uniformly one cent per trip, except in the case of one suburban line. Before the application came on to be heard the railways company on August 28, 1918, filed with the Commission a new tariff schedule putting the increased fares into effect on October 1. The Commission on September 18 filed a complaint on its own motion attacking the reasonableness of the increased fares, so as to bring the matter to an issue, and hearings were started on November 18, occupying in all nine days, in addition to which three days were devoted to arguments, the stenographic record being very voluminous. In addition a number of exhibits were filed, most of which consist of tabulations of figures detailing the results of the railway company's operations from its organization down to the present time, and also showing the enormous increased cost of operation experienced by this Company in the past year or more, particularly with respect to the cost of labor, wage increases since October, 1917, having effected an aggregate increase of more than \$2,000,000 in the company's annual pay roll. The Commission hopes to render its decision in this matter within the next few days.

The Commission has been party to several proceedings in the courts during the year, the various cases being more particularly touched upon in report of the General Counsel, which report, as well as reports of all other department heads, is hereto appended.

Respectfully,

ALBERT G. TOWERS,

Chairman;

JNO. MILTON REIFSNIDER,

JAMES C. LEGG,

Commissioners.

REPORT OF SECRETARY

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1918.

HON. ALBERT G. TOWERS,
*Chairman of the Public Service Commission
 of Maryland.*

DEAR SIR:

The following report of the Secretary of the Commission for the year 1918 is respectfully submitted:

During the year 166 cases were entered on the Formal Docket, of which 150 cases were closed by formal orders entered after careful and exhaustive investigation; hearings were had in all complaint cases before final disposition except where complaint was withdrawn or where complainant admitted satisfaction, thus rendering hearing unnecessary. On the Short Notice and Reparation Docket 73 cases were entered and closed by final orders during the year. Five hundred and seventy-six petty complaints formerly placed on Correspondence Docket but now handled by the Secretary were disposed of during the year.

On the Formal Docket 1,617 cases have been entered since the Commission has been in existence, of which 1,591 have been settled and disposed of by final order, or otherwise, leaving 26 formal cases still open on this Docket as of December 31, 1918, one of which was filed December 23, 1918, but has not yet been set for hearing. During the past year hearings were had in 93 cases. These hearings in several cases extended over a period of from one day to three weeks. Number of formal orders entered in 1918 is 579.

The issue of stocks and bonds has been authorized in the following cases:

	<i>Stocks</i>	<i>Bonds</i>
Maryland Motor Fast Freight Co.	\$35,000 00	
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.....		\$10,234,384 63
Washington County Railroad Co..		7,000 00
(1) Consolidated Power Co. of Balto..		468,000 00
Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Co...		387,000 00
(1) Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company		300 00
Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company.....		1,000,000 00
Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company.....	3,400,000 00	
Northern Virginia Power Co.....		500,000 00
Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company.....		100,000 00
Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co..		20,000,000 00

	<i>Stocks</i>	<i>Bonds</i>
Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company.....		\$100,000 00
Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Co....	\$100,000 00	75,000 00
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission		50,000 00
Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co. of Baltimore City...	14,490,000 00	
Delmar Water Company.....		5,000 00
Trappe Electric Light Company..	5,000 00	
Elkton Water Works, Inc.....	20,250 00	
(2) Baltimore County Water and Electric Company.....		150,000 00
Consumers' Ice Company.....	62,500 00	
Susquehanna Transmission Company of Maryland.....		266,000 00

(1) Three-year Notes.

(2) One to Three-year Notes.

Permission to exercise franchises has been granted to the following corporations:

Maryland Motor Fast Freight Company.

Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore.

Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company—

(In Wicomico County) three franchises.

Northern Virginia Power Company.

United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore—

(In Anne Arundel County.)

(Connecting curves and tracks, Baltimore City.)

Cecilton Electric Light and Power Company.

Maryland Electric Railways Company—

(In Anne Arundel County.)

Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company.

Mayor and City Council of Baltimore—

(Operation of switching railroad.)

Trappe Electric Light Company.

Elkton Water Works, Inc.

A. H. Morris, W. E. Manifold, Henry S. Merriman and James T. Smith—

(Electric plant and distributing system, Harford County.)

Consumers' Ice Company—

(Electric plant and distributing system, Crisfield.)

Potomac Electric Power Company—

(In Prince George's County and Mt. Rainier.)

The abandonment of franchises previously exercised has been permitted in the cases of the following corporations:

Southern Maryland Transit Company.

Peninsular Rapid Transit Company.

Highways Transfer Company.

Maryland Motor Fast Freight Company.

B. T. FENDALL,
Secretary.

REPORT OF GENERAL COUNSEL

BALTIMORE, January 1, 1919.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

GENTLEMEN:

I beg leave to submit the following report for the period from January 1, 1918, to December 31, 1918, with regard to the transactions of my office as General Counsel of the Commission:

I rendered to the Commission 42 opinions in writing touching different questions submitted to me by it. In addition to these formal opinions, I have frequently been called upon to give oral and written advice to the Commission, and have attended numerous conferences held by it.

In my report for the year 1917 I advised the Commission that a petition for rehearing had been filed in the Supreme Court by the plaintiff in error in the case of Pennsylvania Railroad Company, lessee of the Northern Central Railway Company, vs. Albert G. Towers, et al., (The Commutation Rate Case). This petition has now been dismissed by the Court.

The Havre de Grace and Perryville Bridge Case was decided by the Court of Appeals last year; adversely to the contentions of the Commission so far as the opinion went, but not finally as the Commission is aware.

The case of the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster vs. The Consolidated Public Utilities Company of Westminster and the Public Service Commission was appealed by the City of Westminster, after the decision by the Circuit Court for Carroll County (which I reported to you last year) and was argued during the early part of last year; with the result that the Court of Appeals sustained the action of the lower court, which, as you will recall, was favorable to the conditions of the Commission.

It again became necessary to proceed against the Kensington Railway Company in the Montgomery County case. I was compelled to apply for an attachment against it for contempt for violating the preliminary injunction directed by the Court of Appeals. The Company was fined for the contempt and has since complied with the injunction.

The Legislature convened in January and the Commission presented several bills to it for passage, namely, the "Grade Crossing" bill and the "Suspension of Rates" bill and various other bills embodying amendments to the Public Service Commission Law. All of these bills were rejected, with the exception of the following: The bill changing the date for the filing of Annual Reports by Public Service Corporations, and the bill modifying in an important respect the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law in regard to the issuance of stocks, bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness by common carriers and gas and electric corporations.

After the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company rate case was reached for hearing before the Commission and was acted upon by it, appeals from the order of the Commission were taken by the County Commissioners of Baltimore County in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, and by the Associated Improvement Associations of Baltimore County also. Both appeals have been dismissed by the respective appellants.

It became necessary during the year to file a petition for an injunction against Messrs. Fillingame and Krastel, in the Circuit Court for Cecil County at Elkton, to restrain them from operating a motor vehicle in the transportation of passengers for hire without the permission of the Commission. This petition has not been heard up to this time, but will be reached shortly. Petitions for the same reason had to be filed by me in the Circuit Court for Harford County against two other persons. These two petitions are also awaiting a hearing, but will soon be reached for argument.

It was also necessary for me to file an application on behalf of the Commission to have it made a party in the case of William R. Barnes vs. The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, in which the power of the Commission to prescribe rates for the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore was denied. This application was granted by the Court, and I then entered a demurrer on behalf of the Commission to the jurisdiction of the Court. The demurrer was upheld after argument and the case dismissed.

Various matters involving the delay of corporations in carrying out the orders of the Commission have been referred to me during the course of the year and are receiving my close attention. So far the prospect of adjustment in these cases has been too satisfactory to allow me to feel justified in bringing suit against any of the corporations.

I regret to say that before the end of the year Mr. Osborne I. Yellott resigned his position as Assistant Counsel to return to the general practice of the law. The marked ability and untiring industry which he brought to the discharge of his duties are too well known to you to call for any comment by me on the loss that my department has sustained in his resignation. In his place I have appointed Mr. Joseph S. Goldsmith, on the strength of my personal familiarity with his

worth as a man and a lawyer, as well as the general esteem in which he is held among the members of his profession in Baltimore City.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Truly yours,

WILLIAM CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

REPORT OF ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

REPORT

OF

OSBORNE I. YELLOTT, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

TO

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

For the Period January 1, 1918, to September 30, 1918

*To the Hon. W. Cabell Bruce,
General Counsel to the Public Service Commission
of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.*

DEAR SIR:

I submit herewith a report of the work of my office during the period beginning January 1, 1918, and terminating with my resignation and the severance of my official relation with the Public Service Commission September 30, 1918.

GENERAL WORK

During the above period I was frequently called upon by the Commission from time to time to render services of various kinds to it and its several departments in connection with a great number and variety of matters which have come before it for attention. Many of such conferences were informal, and no record of the same was kept in my office.

OPINIONS

From time to time I have given the Commission formal opinions in relatively minor matters, some of these being with respect to the following: Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, effect of Sections 15 and 19 of the Public Service Commission Law; Interstate Motor Express Company in response to its request for an opinion upon a certain phase of the law; Northern Virginia Power Company, pro-

posed bond issue; Potomac Electric Power Company, with respect to proposed bond issue; Complaint of A. G. Campbell vs. P., B. & W. R. R. Co.; Walter F. MacNeal & Co. vs. C. & P. Tel. Co.; O. L. Tunis vs. County Commissioners of Anne Arundel Co. with respect to the Commission's jurisdiction over a county highway bridge; Pocomoke Bridge Company, with respect to transportation free or at reduced rates to State employees and others, and Commissioners of St. Michael's, with respect to their jurisdiction over certain public utilities. In most instances these opinions were submitted to you, and will appear at length in the annual report.

COMPLAINTS

In a number of instances I was assigned as People's Counsel to represent complainants in contested cases before the Commission. Among the more important of these were the complaints as to rates against the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and as to service and rates against The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, the complaint of William H. Stinson vs. The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, the case of Hughes vs. Consolidated Gas Company and the case of Fitzsimmons vs. United Railways and Electric Company.

In a large number of other instances I adjusted without contest before the Commission a number of complaints by individuals against various utilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

The most important cases handled by me during the past year have been those of the application of the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore for increased gas rates and the application of The United Railways and Electric Company for permission to increase its fares one cent.

My work in connection with the former was terminated prior to my resignation as Assistant General Counsel.

In the case of The United Railways and Electric Company I was employed by you as Special Counsel to represent the public and the Commission in the matter of the complaint of the latter against the rates put into effect by the Railways Company upon thirty days' statutory notice. The hearings and arguments in this case were concluded December 19, 1918, and the Commission has since rendered its opinion.

On September 30, 1918, the date upon which my resignation as Assistant General Counsel became effective, the work of my office was completed as far as it was susceptible of being completed at that time, regard being had to the fact that in some instances the work necessary to complete cases was in the hands of other departments.

In my letter to you resigning my position as Assistant General Counsel, I expressed my appreciation of your many kindnesses and courtesies to me while I was your assistant. Throughout the entire period of our official relations you consistently relieved me of and took

upon yourself many duties which were properly mine as Assistant General Counsel, but the performance of which you thought would interfere with a proper performance of my duty as People's Counsel. I have always been fully appreciative of your consideration in this respect, as well as in respect to many other matters which arose from time to time.

Respectfully submitted,

OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,
Former Assistant General Counsel.

REPORT OF ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

REPORT

OF

JOSEPH S. GOLDSMITH, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

TO

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

For the Period October 7, 1918, to December 31, 1918

*To the Hon. W. Cabell Bruce,
General Counsel to the Public Service Commission
of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.*

DEAR SIR:

I entered upon the duties of this office on October 7, 1918. The inevitable delays which are incident to the transfer of the duties of a public office from one incumbent to another, especially when the performance of said duties involves extensive research, and investigation of complicated matters, must be offered as the explanation of my inability to report, at this time, the completion of such number of matters of business as might otherwise be reasonably expected, in the time which has elapsed since the time of my appointment. When I entered upon the duties of the office two matters were pending which required the attention of the Assistant General Counsel. One was the complaint against The United Railways and Electric Company, on account of the increase of carfares to six cents. That case had been pending for some months before my appointment, and a considerable amount of work had been done upon it by my predecessor. He was retained as Special Counsel to complete the task. I carefully examined and considered the evidence in the case, and appeared with Mr. Yellott at the hearing. As you know without my so stating, my capable predecessor needed no suggestions from me, and I therefore took no active part in the controversy.

The other pending case to which my predecessor had been assigned

was the complaint of the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster against the Consolidated Public Utilities Company of Westminster. To that case I have given a considerable amount of time and labor. It was expected that it would be heard before this date, but the Commission found it necessary, for various reasons, to postpone the hearing, and it is now intended that it shall be disposed of during the latter part of the present month.

The complaint of the Mayor and City Council of Havre de Grace against the Havre de Grace Water Company was pending when I entered upon the duties of this office, and I have since been directed to represent and assist the complainant in that case.

There is nothing further worthy of special mention at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH S. GOLDSMITH,
Assistant General Counsel.

REPORT OF ACTING CHIEF ENGINEER

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1918.

HON. A. G. TOWERS,
*Chairman, Public Service Commission of Maryland,
Baltimore, Md.*

DEAR SIR:

I beg to submit herewith report of the operations of the Engineering Department for the current year.

During the year 83 special trips of inspection were made throughout the entire State, as compared with 69 last year. This does not include the many trips to points in the immediate vicinity of Baltimore.

The 131 formal reports made by this department to the Commission may be classified as follows:

SUBJECTS	Steam Railroads.	Electric Railways.	Gas and Electric Companies.	Water Companies.	Phone & Telegraph.	Steam Heating	Totals.
Appraisals, New Equipment and Rates.....	1	4	8	2	15
Grade Crossings.....	12	3	15
SERVICE:							
Complaints.....	4	21	19	5	49
Quality of Gas.....	10	10
Additional Facilities....	2	4	6	12
Miscellaneous.....	1	3	5	6	1	30
Totals.....	13	13	44	39	1	7	131

Many of these reports were very voluminous and required months of work and investigation. Notable among them are: The valuation of the Washington County Water Company of Hagerstown; the Salisbury Water Company; the Havre de Grace Water Company; the Consolidated Public Utilities Company of Westminster, consisting of two water properties, one electric property and one gas property; and the John J. Carlin Heating Company, the latter being a district steam-heating operation.

There was a very general complaint throughout the State on the part of the public against the quality of gas which was supplied during the bitter cold weather of the past winter. Investigation by this Department showed that the condition was due primarily to the fuel situation because of the war, the companies being unable to procure proper gas coal. Many coal-gas companies were compelled to use steam coal, while water-gas companies suffered from failure in delivery of both coal and oil. Some of the complaints, however, were due to the abnormally low temperatures which prevailed, with the resultant high gas consumption, the general shortage in anthracite coal used for domestic purposes inducing the installation of large numbers of gas-heating devices.

It is proper to point out that in the year 1917-18 the public service corporations were confronted with unusual operating difficulties. Those enterprises dependent upon fuel were frequently embarrassed by their inability to get fuel of a suitable character, and on some occasions none was procurable. This obviously led to unsatisfactory service, and in the extreme cases to complete interruptions of supply. This condition was grossly exaggerated by the extreme severity of the winter weather.

The situation was further complicated by abnormally high costs of materials and labor, impossibility of securing deliveries, and the defection of skilled men from permanent organizations under the lure of higher wages in the war industries.

The result of these conditions greatly stimulated complaints generally of service rendered by utilities beyond the normal, despite the efforts of managers to meet the new situation.

I. METER TESTING

Routine tests of gas meters to the number of 23,467 have been made and 9,324 electric meters, 7 gas meters and 7 electric meters were tested upon complaint of consumers, a total of 32,805. Compared with last year, these figures show a decrease of 31.1 per cent. in the total of gas meters tested, and 30.2 per cent. of electric meters. The following table gives the number of gas and electric meters tested for each year during the past eight years:

YEAR.	ROUTINE TESTS.		COMPLAINT METERS.		TOTALS.
	Gas.	Electric.	Gas.	Electric.	
1911.....	24,058	5,592	25	25	29,700
1912.....	27,276	8,819	65	31	36,191
1913.....	31,115	10,143	27	10	41,295
1914.....	33,858	9,959	25	4	43,846
1915.....	32,270	9,310	26	7	41,613
1916.....	30,370	11,969	18	12	42,369
1917.....	34,046	13,362	12	9	47,429
1918.....	23,467	9,324	7	7	32,805
Totals.....	236,460	78,478	205	105	315,248

II. TESTING

Electrical Testing. The laboratory equipment for electrical testing and for portable service testing has been extended during the year by the addition of rotating standards and graphic recording meters.

Gas Testing. More than the usual number of tests of the quality of gas was made throughout the State by reason of the increased complaints resulting from the falling off in the service rendered under the conditions maintaining during the year.

A change in the program of gas testing in the Commission's laboratory was made beginning in November to provide a greater number of daily tests upon which to base the monthly average of the total heating value of the city gas.

III. GRADE CROSSINGS

Reports were made from time to time on grade crossings as complaint or necessity arose for more adequate protection. The most important of these were several crossings in the vicinity of the United States Proving Ground at Aberdeen; the crossing at Severn near Camp Meade on the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad; the crossing of the Maryland Electric Railways at Bush Street, Baltimore; the crossing of The United Railways and Electric Company at D Street, Sparrows Point, with the Sparrows Point Railroad, also one on Belvidere Avenue with the Western Maryland Railroad. Suitable protective devices were installed upon recommendation, those in the latter case now being under construction.

IV. CHANGES IN ENGINEERING STAFF

It is with sincere regret that there is to be recorded the death of Mr. Charles E. Phelps, Jr., who had served the Commission as Chief

Engineer since its organization. Mr. Phelps died December 23, 1918, after a brief illness, of pneumonia.

Two employees of this Department left to enlist in the service of their country—H. C. Ward, Inspector of Gas, and H. C. Nuttle. Their successors are, respectively, Stanley H. Hays, Inspector of Gas, qualified July 22, and Thomas S. Shaw, qualified August 5, 1918.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES G. EDWARDS,

Acting Chief Engineer.

REPORT OF TRANSPORTATION EXPERT

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1918.

HON. ALBERT G. TOWERS,
*Chairman, Public Service Commission
of Maryland.*

DEAR SIR:

I beg to submit herewith the report of your Transportation Department for the year 1918.

During the year 268 formal reports have been made to the Commission. We have, however, been in constant touch with the various transportation officials regarding informal reports, as well as results of observations by myself and inspectors of the department. During the year I have inspected the service and equipment of the various lines throughout the State, such as the Cumberland Electric Railway; Hagerstown and Frederick Railway; lines in the State of Maryland in and out of the District of Columbia; Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad; Annapolis Short Line; Baltimore, Chesapeake and Atlantic Railway; Chesapeake Beach Railway; and others.

The current year has been an unusual one, due to the war conditions. Transportation facilities were greatly impaired and interfered with during the year on account of the shortage of men and material, which caused a decrease in operating facilities compared with the very heavy increase in business. These conditions are improving, and should improve from now on. Better and more adequate service can be expected and demanded.

In Baltimore the street car service has been anything but good during the year, but these conditions are improving, and should improve more rapidly from now on. The company has been making a study for the purpose of rerouting a number of its lines, and during the year has rerouted the cars on seven important lines, namely: Carey Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Druid Hill Avenue, York and Frederick Roads, Roland Park-Boulevard, Garrison Boulevard and Federal Street-Columbia Avenue lines. The rerouting of these lines, while objected to by some patrons of the company, should, in the end,

be a great benefit to the majority, as it will afford better time and avoid a certain amount of congestion on the principal streets of the city.

During the year the Transportation Department was represented at thirty inquests or investigations of casualties, with the view of recommending methods or plans that would avoid loss of life and personal injury.

ACCIDENTS

A comparative summary of the total number of accidents to persons during the last eight years is submitted below, the accidents being tabulated as between those occurring on steam railroads and electric railways:

TOTAL PERSONAL ACCIDENTS COMPARED BY YEARS

YEAR.	CLASS OF PERSONS	STEAM RAILROADS		ELECTRIC RAILWAYS		GRAND TOTAL	
		K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
1911.....	Public.....	63	190	31	5,670	94	5,860
	Employees..	38	677	4	1,192	42	1,869
1912.....	Public.....	94	148	33	6,365	127	6,513
	Employees..	40	799	2	1,367	42	2,166
1913.....	Public.....	96	244	32	3,748	128	3,992
	Employees..	70	902	3	1,414	73	2,316
1914.....	Public.....	72	233	35	7,213	107	7,446
	Employees..	37	1,044	5	1,400	42	2,444
1915.....	Public.....	90	257	31	6,395	121	6,652
	Employees..	29	813	5	1,249	34	2,062
1916.....	Public.....	78	144	29	6,244	107	6,388
	Employees..	35	852	4	1,250	39	2,102
1917.....	Public.....	89	195	46	6,398	135	6,593
	Employees..	45	866	10	1,560	55	2,426
1918.....	Public.....	85	196	69	5,312	154	5,508
	Employees..	55	811	2	1,477	57	2,288
Totals....	Public.....	667	1,607	306	47,345	973	48,952
	Employees..	349	6,764	35	10,909	384	17,673
Grand Totals.....		1,016	8,371	341	58,254	1,357	66,625

Out of the above total accidents to persons, those which occurred at grade crossings for each year during the last eight years are as follows:

GRADE CROSSING ACCIDENTS COMPARED BY YEARS

YEAR.	COMPANY.	KILLED.	INJURED.	TOTAL.
1911.....	Steam Railroads.....	11	7	18
	Electric Railways.....			
1912.....	Steam Railroads.....	12	10	22
	Electric Railways.....			
1913.....	Steam Railroads.....	12	44	56
	Electric Railways.....			
1914.....	Steam Railroads.....	8	40	48
	Electric Railways.....			
1915.....	Steam Railroads.....	15	49	64
	Electric Railways.....			
1916.....	Steam Railroads.....	18	39	57
	Electric Railways.....			
1917.....	Steam Railroads.....	44	103	147
	Electric Railway.....			
1918.....	Steam Railroads.....	38	101	139
	Electric Railways.....			
	Totals.....	158	393	551
	Averages per year.....	20	49	69

Those accidents to persons trespassing upon railroad property have been segregated, and are as follows:

FATALITIES AND INJURIES DUE TO TRESPASSING UPON RAILROADS—
COMPARISON BY YEARS

YEAR.	B. & O. R. R.		Penna. R. R.		W. Md. Ry.		Minor Steam.		Minor Electric.		Totals.	
	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.	K.	I.
1911.....	53	22	30	51	9	20	6	4	10	5	108	102
1912.....	45	45	20	9	9	17	15	7	9	7	98	85
1913.....	42	30	20	26	10	80	16	4	5	16	93	156
1914.....	38	41	15	37	8	25	7	14	9	19	77	136
1915.....	38	28	10	12	12	15	12	12	6	19	78	86
1916.....	36	18	10	9	9	9	4	3	10	1	69	40
1917.....	27	13	10	8	4	9	6	2	10	4	57	36
1918.....	18	15	13	11	4	3	1	13	12	49	41
Totals.....	297	212	128	163	65	178	67	46	72	83	629	682
										KILLED.	INJURED	
Total Steam Railroads.....										557	599	
Total Electric Railways.....										72	83	
Grand Total (8 years).....										629	682	

For the year 1918 this department issued permits for the operation of motor vehicles for the public transportation of passengers and freight, as follows:

For passenger service.....	242
For freight service.....	79
<hr/>	
Total permits issued.....	321

The work of this department has been kept up to date, and it is a pleasure to commend the work of the employees of the department.

Respectfully submitted,

B. W. DUER,

Transportation Expert.

REPORT OF RATE CLERK

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1918.

HON. ALBERT G. TOWERS,
Chairman.

DEAR SIR:

The report of the Rate Department of the Commission upon its work during the current year is submitted herewith.

The year just ending has wrought many changes in the matter of rate regulation, particularly with respect to common carriers. Late in the year 1917 the President of the United States issued a proclamation taking over the control of the railroads throughout the country and appointed a Director General of Railroads to operate same. Section 10 of the Act of Congress of March 21, 1918, provides that during the period of Federal control the President may, whenever in his opinion the public interest requires, initiate rates, fares, charges and classifications, regulations and practices by filing the same with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Acting under authority of the Act aforesaid the President has, through the agency of the Director General of Railroads, upon several occasions exercised the power to change rates, the most notable instance being in the case of General Order No. 28 issued under date of May 25, 1918. The effect of this order was to substantially increase the freight rates and passenger fares of all of the railroads under Federal control, which control embraces practically all of the important railroads operating within the State of Maryland. As by the Act of Congress above referred to the rates initiated by the President are required to be filed only with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and as such rates affecting Maryland intrastate traffic are not filed with the Public Service Commission of Maryland, the effect has been to seriously interfere with the usefulness and integrity of the Commission's railroad tariff files.

As the railroads were taken over by the Federal Government as a war emergency measure, legislation designed to permanently establish their status and regulation is now to be expected; what this legislation will be it is, of course, impossible to foretell, the suggested legislation ranging all the way from permanent government ownership, on the one hand, to a return to their pre-war status on the other. As pointed out to the Commission in my Report No. 205 dated June 25, 1918, the unsatisfactory condition of the Commission's railroad tariff files resulting from the rate procedure under Federal control has made it necessary for the Commission to temporarily, at least, suspend the publication of the monthly tariff bulletins heretofore issued and distributed by the Commission.

On August 1, 1918, the control and operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States passed into the hands of the Federal Government, the Postmaster General being placed in charge of their operation. The Act of Congress authorizing the President to assume control specifically limits the period of Federal control to the duration of the war in which this nation was then engaged, and the companies will therefore return to their pre-war status upon the ratification of the treaty of peace unless in the interim additional legislation is enacted further extending the period of Federal control. With the exception of certain installation charges inaugurated by the Postmaster General the rate structure of these companies has not yet been seriously disturbed, though the Postmaster General has recently promulgated new toll rates to become effective January 21, 1919, which will have the result of changing many existing rates for such service.

With respect to the various utilities of all kinds under the jurisdiction of the Commission, the year has been a most trying one. The costs of labor and materials, which had been increasing steadily for several years past, probably reached the peak point late in the present year. To enable the utilities to continue rendering service to the public and to maintain their credit it has been necessary for practically all of such utilities to increase the rates charged the public for the services and commodities supplied by them. Some companies have found it necessary to increase the rates several times during the same year. As before stated, it is believed that the peak prices were reached a short while ago, and that from now on the trend will be in the opposite direction. To my mind, the period of readjustment, or transition, now starting will afford abundant opportunity to demonstrate the real and lasting worth of public regulation of public service utilities, and it is perhaps safe to say that the coming year bids fair to be one of the busiest and most important yet experienced by the Commission.

A large number of complaints and inquiries have been referred to this department for investigation and report, and in the course of the year one hundred and two formal reports have been submitted to the Commission. In addition to the matters referred to this department by the Commission, inquiries are constantly being received through

telephone and personal calls respecting various questions involving rates and the interpretation of schedules, many of which matters are satisfactorily adjusted informally.

During the year orders authorizing the filing of new or amended schedules of rates, fares and charges upon less than statutory notice were entered in sixty-seven cases, and orders permitting the refund of excessive freight charges were entered in six cases, the aggregate amount of charges refunded under orders of the Commission being \$1,304.24.

I take this opportunity to again direct the attention of the Commission to the desirability of adopting revised rules to govern the construction, filing and publication of rate schedules of public utility companies other than common carriers, under the jurisdiction of the Commission, draft of which revised rules was transmitted by me to the Commission with my Report No. 64 dated November 24, 1916.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK HARPER,
Rate Clerk.

REPORT OF AUDITOR

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1918.

HON. ALBERT G. TOWERS,
*Chairman, Public Service Commission,
Baltimore, Md.*

DEAR SIR:

I beg to submit herewith the report of the work of my office for the calendar year ended December 31, 1918.

In my report for the year ended December 31, 1917, I called the attention of the Commission to the advisability of having the Legislature of Maryland, at its 1918 session, change the period for making annual reports to this Commission, of all public utility corporations under its jurisdiction, from the fiscal year ending June 30, to the calendar year. Such action was taken by the Legislature at its last session, therefore the annual statistical tables of the operations of the various public utilities operating in the State of Maryland are compiled for the year ended December 31, 1917. Only in a few instances did this change cause any inconvenience to the companies affected and from now on should occasion general satisfaction.

The fiscal year of the Commission ended September 30, 1918, and it was necessary to change the accounting system of this office to conform with the budget system recently adopted for all State offices. It

has been the pleasure of this office to co-operate with the Comptroller's office in the efficient operation of this system.

Owing to the fact that the recent war necessitated the calling of so many young men from the offices of the companies required to report, considerable delay was experienced in preparing the reports.

During the year I was called upon frequently for advice in matters pertaining to proper accounting methods by a good many companies throughout the State.

The annual reports of one hundred and fifty-six companies were duly filed in this office and twenty-eight companies made no report.

I have prepared the following statement:

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CORPORATIONS UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE
COMMISSION FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1916,
AND DECEMBER 31, 1917**

	<i>Dec. 31, 1916</i>	<i>Dec. 31, 1917</i>	<i>Increase or Decrease</i>
	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Amount</i>	
Capital Stock Outstanding...	\$772,478,772	\$783,953,762	\$11,474,990
Funded Debt.....	862,098,387	896,310,531	34,212,144
Total Capitalization.....	\$1,634,577,159	\$1,680,264,293	\$45,687,134
Interest Accrued on Funded Debt	\$34,355,317	\$34,798,703	\$443,386
Dividends Declared on Capital Stock	55,848,937	44,829,099	*11,019,838

* Denotes decrease.

During the fiscal year there was collected and remitted to the Treasurer of Maryland fees amounting to \$1,466.56.

Below is a detailed statement of disbursements for the year ended September 30, 1918:

OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918

Salaries	\$76,413 64
Rent	6,000 00
Furniture	454 15
Engineers' Apparatus.....	545 91
Court Costs.....	1,483 21
Special Services.....	2,780 76

General Expenses:

Printing and Stationery.....	\$2,544 68
Postage	878 00
Telephone	551 26
Library	381 10
Travelling	1,763 34
Inspection Materials.....	16 21
Stenography	172 50
Office Incidentals.....	986 21
	<hr/>
	\$7,293 30

Total Expenses for Year..... \$94,970 97

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES F. DUNN, JR.,
Auditor.

APPENDIX I

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR, OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER
30, 1918, INCLUSIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES.

SALARIES.

Albert G. Towers, Chairman.....	\$6,000 00
John Milton Reifsnider, Commissioner.....	5,000 00
E. Clay Timanus, Commissioner.....	3,938 15
James C. Legg, Commissioner.....	1,061 83
Benjamin T. Fendall, Secretary.....	3,000 00
William Cabell Bruce, General Counsel.....	4,800 00
Osborne I. Yellott, Assistant General Counsel	\$3,000 00
Osborne I. Yellott, Assistant General Counsel, Special Appropriation....	1,800 00
	4,800 00
James F. Dunn, Jr., Auditor.....	2,500 00
Frank F. Kormann, Stenographer.....	1,950 00
Edward S. Brittain, Stenographer to General Counsel	1,500 00
G. Archer Hays, Stenographer.....	1,400 00
Charles E. King, Chief Stenographer.....	1,950 00
Gertrude C. Cottman, Stenographer.....	1,220 00
Emily C. Harrison, Assistant Stenographer to General Counsel.....	900 00
Frank Harper, Rate Clerk.....	2,150 00
Christian E. Neumann, Office Boy.....	100 00
Marie Kelly, Telephone Operator.....	644 00
Anna S. Talkin, Stenographer.....	1,058 07
Maude Stewart, Stenographer.....	690 00
Alice L. M. Tubbs, Stenographer.....	222 50
Edith Chapman, Stenographer.....	585 00
Charles E. Phelps, Jr., Chief Engineer.....	4,800 00
Charles G. Edwards, Assistant Engineer.....	3,600 00

Luke Ellis, Assistant Engineer.....	1,825 48
J. Garland Turner, Clerk—Engineering Department	1,220 00
William T. Russell, Superintendent Inspector...	1,840 00
H. Clay Ward, Laboratory Assistant.....	700 00
John H. Marley, Meter Inspector.....	1,000 00
James W. Ebaugh, Meter Inspector.....	1,029 74
Stanley H. Hays, Laboratory Assistant.....	232 26
Thomas O. M. Baumgartner, File Clerk.....	20 00
James R. Dunlop, Stenographer.....	1,300 00
Benjamin M. Haughey, Transportation Inspector	876 66
Albert L. Deen, Transportation Inspector.....	900 00
L. J. Harrington, Transportation Inspector.....	800 00
Joseph T. Birckhead, Transportation Inspector..	1,200 00
W. G. Dawson, Chief Clerk.....	1,800 00
Harold C. Nuttle, File Clerk.....	605 70
Henry W. Hynson, Transportation Inspector...	1,200 00
Ross S. Hans, Messenger.....	486 30
Ross S. Hans, Inspector.....	300 00
Louis Sellman, Transportation Inspector.....	277 40
Gilbert Hagadone, Transportation Inspector....	954 84
Bruce W. Duer, Transportation Expert.....	3,600 00
Thomas S. Shaw, File Clerk.....	165 71
Nellie L. Ford, Telephone Operator.....	60 00
Edna Strouse, Stenographer.....	50 00
Muriel B. Hine, Stenographer.....	10 00
Helen J. Lease, Stenographer.....	90 00

Total Salaries for the Year Ended September 30th, 1918. \$76,413 64

EXPENSES

Rent	\$6,000 00
Furniture	454 15
Engineer's Apparatus.....	545 91
Court Costs.....	1,483 21
Stenography	172 50
Printing and Stationery.....	2,544 68
Postage	878 00
Telephone	551 26
Library	381 10
Traveling	1,763 34
Inspection Materials.....	16 21

Incidentals:

Towels	\$114 00
Water	80 00
Ice	87 50
Time Clock.....	24 00

Newspapers and Periodicals.....	61 02	
Inspecting Dictagraphs.....	30 50	
Telegrams	18 11	
Expressage	18 57	
Advertising	67 00	
Repairs	241 59	
Dues, National Association of Rail- way Commissioners.....	25 00	
Witness Fees.....	60 80	
Signs on Doors.....	5 00	
Sundries	149 97	
Notary Fees.....	3 15	
	<hr/>	986 21

Special Services:

Robert B. Peter, Attorney—P. S. C. of Md. vs. Kensington Railway Co.....	50 00
Miles & Miles, Attorneys—P. S. C. of Md. vs. O. B. Catlin.....	51 90
The Baltimore County Water & Electric Co. Case No. 375. N. S. Hill, S. F. Ferguson, John H. Gregory.....	2,678 86

Total Expenses for Year Ended September 30th, 1918.. \$18,557 33

Total Salaries and Expenses for Year Ended September
30th, 1918..... \$94,970 97

Appropriation for Year Ended September 30th, 1918, Acts
1916, Chapter 684..... \$95,000 00
Salaries and Expenses for Year Ended September 30, 1918 94,970 97

Unexpended Balance Returned to State of Maryland.... \$29 03

**RECEIPTS FROM OFFICE FEES TRANSMITTED TO THE
TREASURER OF MARYLAND FOR THE FISCAL YEAR
OCTOBER 1ST, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30TH, 1918.**

1917:

October	\$85 10
November	5 00
December	153 95

1918:

January	42 90
February	25 30
March	18 90

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

April	372 00
May	330 60
June	106 40
July	126 70
August	144 45
September	2 00

Total Office Fees for Year Ended September 30, 1918 \$1,413 30

MISCELLANEOUS.

1917:

Interest on Bank Balance—December..... \$22 41

1918:

Interest on Bank Balance—May..... 30 85

53 26

Total Receipts for Year Ended September 30, 1918.. \$1,466 56

RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

E. Clay Timanus, Commissioner, term expired June 14, 1918.

James C. Legg, Commissioner, appointed June 15, 1918.

Osborne I. Yellott, resigned September 30, 1918.

Emily C. Harrison, resigned September 30, 1918.

Christian E. Neumann, resigned November 30, 1917.

Marie Kelly, resigned September 7, 1918.

Anna S. Talkin, resigned August 19, 1918.

Alice L. M. Tubbs, appointed July 1, 1918.

Edith Chapman, resigned June 30, 1918.

H. Clay Ward, resigned May 1, 1918.

Stanley H. Hays, appointed July 8, 1918.

Thomas O. N. Baumgartner, temporarily employed.

Albert L. Deen, resigned July 1, 1918.

L. J. Harrington, resigned June 1, 1918.

Louis S. Sellman, appointed July 8, 1918.

Gilbert Hagadone, appointed December 15, 1917.

Thomas S. Shaw, appointed August 12, 1918.

Nellie L. Ford, appointed September 1, 1918.

Edna Strouse, appointed September 16, 1918.

Muriel B. Hine, appointed August 19, 1918; resigned August 21, 1918.

Helen J. Lease, appointed September 4, 1918.

APPENDIX II

OPINIONS AND ORDERS OF THE COMMISSION

ORDER No. 4036.

In the Matter of

The petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff Eliminating Exceptions Applying on Diversion and Reconsignment of Bituminous Coal in Hopper or Self-Clearing Cars.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 481.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this second day of January, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff eliminating exceptions applying on diversion and reconsignment of bituminous coal in hopper or self-clearing cars, now published on page 3 of petitioner's freight tariff AA—P. S. C. Md. No. 60,

PROVIDED, Said tariff be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4036 of date January 2nd, 1918."

ORDER No. 4038.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. 819.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.
S. N. & R. Docket.
Case No. 482.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 819, establishing rate of 60 cents per 2,000 pounds on brick, carloads, minimum weight 60,000 pounds, from Westport, Maryland, to Canton, Maryland, Canton Railroad delivery,

PROVIDED, Said supplement containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4038 of date January 2nd, 1918."

ORDER No. 4039.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 156.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.
S. N. & R. Docket.
Case No. 483.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the

Commission and the public petitioner's freight tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 156, establishing rates on manure, carloads, minimum weight 40,000 pounds, from Camp Meade, Admiral, Maryland, to stations on line of petitioner as shown in exhibit filed herein,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4039 of date January 2nd, 1918."

ORDER No. 4040.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 157.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 484.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 157, establishing rate of 50 cents per 2,000 pounds on cinder, carloads, from Baltimore, Maryland, to Melvale, Maryland.

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4040 of date January 2nd, 1918."

ORDER No. 4062.

In the Matter of

The Petition of NORFOLK AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement No. 2 to Petitioner's Passenger Fare Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 80 to Withdraw and Cancel the Present Arrangements for the Movement of All Classes of Private and Other Special Passenger Cars of Any Type Whatsoever, Except Federal or State Government Cars, and to Discontinue the Practice of Furnishing or Hauling Special or Private Passenger Cars.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 485.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 5th day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Norfolk and Western Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, Supplement No. 2 to petitioner's passenger fare schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 80 to withdraw and cancel the present arrangements for the movement of all classes of private and other special passenger cars of any type whatsoever, except Federal or State Government cars, and to discontinue the practice of furnishing or hauling special or private passenger cars,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4062 of date January 5th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4065.

In the Matter of The Application of THE MARYLAND MOTOR FAST FREIGHT COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of Its Franchise and for Authority to Issue \$35,000.00, Par Value, of Its Capital Stock.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1452.
---	---	---

WHEREAS, The Maryland Motor Fast Freight Company has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise of its franchise granted it under its certificate of incorporation, a copy of which is filed in these proceedings, and for authority to issue \$35,000.00 par value of its capital stock; and,

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4037 passed January 2nd, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of said franchise is convenient for the public service, and that the issue of said capital stock is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the exercise by The Maryland Motor Fast Freight Company of the franchise granted by the certificate of incorporation above referred to be, and the same hereby is, permitted and approved.

2. That the issue by said The Maryland Motor Fast Freight Company of \$35,000.00 par value of its capital stock for the acquisition of property and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its facilities is hereby authorized and approved; \$33,000.00 par value thereof to be sold for cash at par and \$2,000.00 par value thereof to be issued to Walter Miles and Michael Hurwitz for service furnished in connection with the organization of the applicant corporation, as more particularly set forth in application filed herein.

3. That said The Maryland Motor Fast Freight Company shall make reports to the Commission duly verified by affidavits as follows:

(a) Upon the issue and sale for cash or otherwise of its stock, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue and sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said stock, and the facts and circumstances as to the property acquired and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its facilities.

ORDER No. 4070.

In the Matter of

The Petition of Railroads Operating Within the State of Maryland for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Freight Tariffs to Become Effective on January 21st, 1918, Changing Demurrage Rules, Regulations and Charges in Compliance with Order No. 3 of the Director General of Railroads.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 486.

WHEREAS, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, by H. C. Smith, its Freight Tariff Agent, has, on behalf of all railroads operating within the State of Maryland, made application to this Commission for permission under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to file and publish on less than statutory notice freight tariffs to become effective on January 21st, 1918, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges in compliance with Order No. 3 of the Director General of Railroads, so as to provide:

"A. (1) Forty-eight hours (two days) free time for loading or unloading on all commodities.

"(2) Twenty-four hours (one day) free time on cars held for any other purpose permitted by tariff.

"B. Demurrage charges per car per day or fraction of a day until car is released, as follows: Three dollars for the first day, \$4.00 for the second day, and for each succeeding additional day the charge to be increased \$1.00 in excess of that for the preceding day until a maximum charge of \$10.00 per car per day shall be reached on the eighth day of detention beyond free time, the charge thereafter to be \$10.00 per car per day or fraction thereof. These charges will supersede all those named in existing tariffs applicable to domestic freight, and specifically contemplate the cancellation of all average agreement provisions of existing tariffs.

"No change is authorized hereby to be made in demurrage rules, regulations and charges applying on foreign export freight awaiting ships at export points." And

WHEREAS, After due consideration it appears that the application of said railroads is reasonable and proper, and should be granted, it is this 10th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given to all railroads operating within the State of Maryland in whose behalf said application has been made to this Commission to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission the public freight tariffs to become effective on January 21st, 1918, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges in compliance with Order No. 3 of the Director General of Railroads, as hereinbefore set forth.

PROVIDED, That tariffs containing said rules, regulations and charges shall be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order, and shall be published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4070 of date January 10th, 1918."

AND IT IS FURTHER Ordered, That by passing this order the Public Service Commission is not to be taken as in any sense whatever approving any rules, regulations or charges that may be filed under the authority of this order; all such rules, regulations and charges being left as fully subject to investigation and correction on complaint, or on the Commission's own motion under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law as if this order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4071.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE
AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF
BALTIMORE CITY and JOHN N. ARNDT,
ET AL., Trading Under the Name of
McDONOUGH RURAL TELEPHONE COM-
PANY in the Village of Owings Mills,
Baltimore County, Maryland, for an
Order Approving the Sale by the Latter
and the Purchase by the Former Com-
pany of All of the Property, Personal
and Real, of Said McDONOUGH RURAL
TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1449.

The joint application of The Chseapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City and of John N. Arndt, Rowland R. Hayward, Harry M. Benzinger and Annie C. Hook, trading as McDonough Rural Telephone Company, filed with the Public Service Commission of Maryland on the 21st day of December, 1917, together with Exhibits

Nos. 1 and 2 referred to therein, for permission and approval of the Commission of the agreement dated the 3rd day of May, in the year 1917, by the terms of which the said individuals trading under the name of McDonough Rural Telephone Company, grant, bargain, sell, transfer, convey and assign unto the said The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, all their right, title and interest in the poles, brackets, wires, guys, installations, wall sets, desk stands and desk stand bells, as in said agreement more particularly described, upon the terms and conditions in said agreement set out, the consideration of said agreement being the sum of One Dollar and the cancellation of the existing service line contract between your applicants, which said consideration has been paid and performed, a true copy of which agreement together with the plat therein referred to is filed in these proceedings marked "Applicants' Exhibit No. 1," coming on to be heard; and it appearing to the Commission that the order of the Commission setting this matter for hearing on the 4th day of January, 1918, at 10 o'clock A. M., has been duly published in accordance with said order; and it further appearing to the Commission that the parties to the aforesaid agreement were and are duly authorized by law to enter into and execute the same; and it further appearing to the Commission from the petition and the evidence in support thereof given on the hearing of the application, that the things to which the Commission's permission and approval are asked are proper and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 11th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the approval and permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland are hereby given to the agreement between the applicants herein, dated the 3rd day of May, in the year 1917, a true copy of which is filed in these proceedings marked "Applicants' Exhibit No. 1," and the said John N. Arndt, Rowland R. Hayward, Henry M. Benzinger and Annie C. Hook, trading under the name of McDonough Rural Telephone Company, and The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, be, and they are hereby permitted to fulfill and abide by all the terms and conditions thereof.

ORDER No. 4072.

In the Matter of

The Petition of Railroads Operating Within the State of Maryland for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Tariffs Canceling Tariffs Heretofore Filed with the Commission by Said Railroads Changing the Rules, Regulations and Charges Governing Diversion and Reconsignment of Carload Traffic Originally Intended to Become Effective on March 15th, 1917, and Later Dates, and Subsequently Suspended Until January 13th, 1918, and Later Dates, Under Authority of This Commission's Circular No. 10G.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 487.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 11th day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given railroads operating within the State of Maryland to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public tariffs canceling tariffs heretofore filed with the Commission by said railroads changing the rules, regulations and charges governing diversion and reconsignment of carload traffic originally intended to become effective on March 15th, 1917, and later dates, and subsequently suspended until January 13th, 1918, and later dates, under authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10G,

PROVIDED, Said tariffs be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4072 of date January 11th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4074.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of PATAPSCO AND BACK		Public Service Commission
RIVERS RAILROAD COMPANY for an		of Maryland.
Order Permitting and Approving a		Case No. 1455.
Change in the Location of a Part of		
Its Line.		

WHEREAS, It appears from the petition and exhibit filed in the above entitled matter that the proposed change in the location of Patapsco and Back Rivers Railroad is necessary and convenient for the public service, and this Commission having decided after investigation that a hearing in this case is not necessary under the terms and provisions of Section 26 of the Public Service Commission Law,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This fourteenth day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the change of location as set forth in the above application and more particularly shown on the blueprint filed therewith, be and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4076.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of HARRY N. HOPKINS		Public Service Commission
for a Permit for the Operation of a		of Maryland.
Motor Vehicle for Public Use.		Case No. 1453.

WHEREAS, Harry N. Hopkins having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of a motor vehicle for public use in the transportation of passengers between Bel Air, Maryland, and Havre de Grace, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on for hearing in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4041 passed January 3rd, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of Harry N. Hopkins in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby granted and that the permit

applied for be issued between Bel Air, Maryland, and Havre de Grace, Maryland,

PROVIDED, That the operations of said Harry N. Hopkins under authority of the permit hereby authorized to be issued shall be conducted in accordance with schedule heretofore filed with the Commission by John T. Hopkins, Jr., operations under which schedule were permitted by this Commission's permit A-149, as revised June 30th, 1917, and subject to the same conditions and restrictions as in said permit A-149 contained.

ORDER No. 4079.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CONSOLIDATED POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for Permission and Authority to the Former Corporation to Begin Construction and Exercise Its Rights and Privileges Under Gas Franchises Granted to It by the County Commissioners of Baltimore County and to Lease Said Franchises for a Term of Twenty-five Years to THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, and for Permission and Authority to THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE to Make Said Lease.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1454.

WHEREAS, The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore has applied to this Commission for an order and certificate of authority granting to it the permission and approval of this Commission to begin construction and to exercise the rights and privileges of said corporation under the gas franchises heretofore granted by the assent of the County Commissioners of Baltimore County, and The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore have applied for an order authorizing and approving a lease by The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore of the aforesaid franchises of the former corporation subject to, for the term and upon the terms and conditions of, the existing twenty-five year lease from The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power

Company of Baltimore heretofore authorized and approved by this Commission; and

WHEREAS, After consideration of the said application of The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and the exhibit filed therewith, and after due hearing, the Commission is of the opinion that such construction and such exercise of rights and privileges under said gas franchises by The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore is necessary and convenient for the public service.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 18th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore be and it is hereby authorized to begin construction and to exercise its rights and privileges under the gas franchises heretofore granted by the assent of the County Commissioners of Baltimore County;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore be and they are hereby authorized to execute, make and carry out a lease by The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore of the aforesaid gas franchises of the former corporation subject to, for the term and upon the terms and conditions of, the existing twenty-five year lease from The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore heretofore authorized and approved by this Commission;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That said The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore shall make a report verified by affidavit, to this Commission as follows:

Upon the consummation of such lease from The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, the fact of such lease and the terms and conditions thereof, including a complete copy thereof.

ORDER No. 4083.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 934, Establishing Rates on Manure, Carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to Points on Line of Petitioner.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 488.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 19th day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 934 establishing rates on manure, carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to points on line of petitioner; said rates to apply to the points and be the same as rates shown in petitioner's Exhibit "A," filed herein,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4083 of date January 19th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4088.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY and the MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Dated November 28th, 1917, for the Purchase by the Former and the Sale by the Latter of 17 Poles Located on Light Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1462.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the

purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-second day of January, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4089.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE
AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF
BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of
an Agreement Dated October 5th, 1917,
with SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND
POWER COMPANY for the Sale by the
Latter and the Purchase by the Former
of One Pole in the City of Salisbury,
Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1463.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-second day of January, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4090.

In the Matter of
TIDEWATER PORTLAND CEMENT COMPANY,
Complainant,

vs.

PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON
RAILROAD COMPANY

and

WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS
ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY,
Defendants.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 489.

REPARATION CLAIM \$19.95.

This is a petition filed by Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, by E. P. Bates, its Assistant Freight Traffic Manager, and joined in by Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company, by W. W. Wright, its Auditor, on behalf of Tidewater Portland Cement Company, complainant, for permission to refund unto said complainant that portion of freight bill rendered and collected from said complainant by said railroad companies which is in excess of a just and reasonable charge upon shipment of cement between points on defendants' lines within the State of Maryland.

The petition sets forth that on August 13th, 1917, shipment was made by the complainant herein over the railroads of the defendant companies, in connection with Western Maryland Railway Company, from Union Bridge, Maryland, to Annapolis, Maryland, of one carload of cement weighing 57,000 pounds on which was charged rate of 37 cents per 2,000 pounds from Union Bridge to Fulton Junction, Baltimore, Maryland, as per Western Maryland Railway Company's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 702, and sixth class rate of 9.5 cents per 100 pounds from Fulton Junction to Annapolis, as per Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 446, plus 15 cents per 2,000 pounds for delivery to Naval Academy, as provided in said tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. 446, which delivery charge is not herein involved. Shipment moved over Western Maryland Railway from Union Bridge to Fulton Junction, the charge for which movement is also not now questioned or involved in this application; from Fulton Junction to Odenton, Maryland, shipment moved over Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad and thence over Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad to destination.

The sixth class rate from other Baltimore stations to Annapolis was, at time this shipment moved, 6 cents per 100 pounds, and in order to have this same rate apply from all Baltimore stations the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company on August 17th, 1917, filed with this Commission Supplement No. 1 to its freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 446, effective August 23rd, 1917, reducing the sixth class rate from Fulton Junction to Annapolis to 6 cents per 100 pounds and it is on basis of this subsequently established rate that application to make reparation is now made.

The complainant claims and the defendants admit that the proportional rate lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipment moved from Fulton Junction to Annapolis was under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of 6 cents per 100 pounds, as set forth in Supplement No. 1 to Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 446, would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipment in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 22nd day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company and said Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Tidewater Portland Cement Company, the sum of \$19.95, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$54.15, for the carload weighing 57,000 pounds, based on rate of 9.5 cents per 100 pounds and the amount properly chargeable, \$34.20, at the rate of 6 cents per 100 pounds, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipment in question from Fulton Junction, Baltimore, Maryland, to Annapolis, Maryland, but not including delivery to Naval Academy.

FURTHER Ordered, That unless otherwise ordered by this Commission the rate on cement, carloads, from Fulton Junction to Annapolis shall not exceed the rate contemporaneously in effect on same commodity, carloads, from other Baltimore stations to Annapolis, over the same route, for a period of one year from the date of this order.

ORDER No. 4093.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 160, Establishing Rates on Manure, Carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to Points on Line of Petitioner.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 490.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 24th day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 160, establishing rates on manure, carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to points on line of petitioner; said rates to apply to the points and be the same as rates shown in petitioner's exhibit filed herein, .

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4093 of date January 24th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4094.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 866 Publishing Tidewater Demurrage Rules and Regulations Covering Cars Containing Coal, Anthracite and Bituminous, and Coke, Held for Trans-shipment at Baltimore Terminals, Which Said Tariff Now Stands Suspended Until February 8th, 1918, Under Authority of This Commission's Circular No. 10G, Canceling Said Suspension as of February 7th, 1918.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 491.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 24th day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 866 publishing tidewater demurrage rules and regulations covering cars containing coal, anthracite and bituminous, and coke, held for trans-shipment at Baltimore terminals, which said tariff now stands suspended until February 8th, 1918, under authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10G, canceling said suspension as of February 7th, 1918.

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4094 of date January 24th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4095

In the Matter of The Application of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$10,284,384.63 of Its Refund- ing and General Mortgage Bonds, Series A.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1460.
--	---	---

WHEREAS, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company has filed with this Commission an application from which it appears that said company has paid \$732,000 of underlying bonds secured by mortgage upon its railroads and property, and has expended upon the railroads and property subject to its Refunding and General Mortgage between December 1st, 1915, and November 30th, 1917, \$9,552,384.63, for which expenditures no bonds have been issued under said mortgage or other mortgages of said company, and said company desires to issue and sell or pledge \$10,284,384.63 of its Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds, Series A, to reimburse it for expenditures so made; and the Commission being of opinion that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of such bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of the said corporation;

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 24th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the issue and sale or pledge of \$10,284,384.63 of said Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds of The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company for the uses and purposes aforesaid is hereby approved.

ORDER No. 4096.

In the Matter of The Application of WASHINGTON COUNTY RAILROAD COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$7,000.00 of Its Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1461.
---	---	---

WHEREAS, The Washington County Railroad Company has applied to this Commission for authority to issue its Refunding and General Mortgage 5% Bonds to the amount of \$7,000.00 (to be secured by a trust mortgage of its railroad, property and franchises) for the purpose of paying off an existing indebtedness of said company to The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company amounting to \$7,000.00, and

WHEREAS, Said company appears to be indebted to The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company for advances made to it for the improvement and extension of its lines of railroad to said amount of \$7,000.00, in payment of which amount The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company has agreed to accept said \$7,000.00, par value, of bonds bearing interest at the rate of 5% per annum and maturing December 1st, 1995, and to be deposited with the Trustees of certain of The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company's mortgages as further security, as set forth in the trust mortgage hereinbefore first mentioned; and

WHEREAS, After due hearing, the Commission is of opinion that the issuance, as aforesaid, of said \$7,000.00 of bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of said company, to wit, the payment of said indebtedness,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 24th day of January, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That said Washington County Railroad Company be, and is hereby, authorized to issue its Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds to the amount of \$7,000.00, as aforesaid.

2. That upon issuing said bonds, and making application thereof to the payment of said indebtedness, the said Washington County Railroad Company shall report said facts to this Commission, duly verified by the proper affidavit or affidavits.

ORDER No. 4097.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of THE CITY DAIRY COMPANY, SCHIER BRANCH,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>FARMINGTON MILK TRUCK COMPANY</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1459.</p>
--	---	---

The above cause having been previously set for hearing and having been heard on the date hereof, when both parties were represented in person, and an oral opinion having been rendered by the Commission, through Commissioner Timanus, wherein the conclusion was reached that the respondent should be required to continue to accept and transport milk consigned to the Schier Branch of The City Dairy Company and Ditch Brothers and deliver same to the plants of said Schier Branch of The City Dairy Company and Ditch Brothers, in the City of Baltimore, so long as the respondent shall continue to operate as a common carrier under permit of this Commission,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 25th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the respondent, the said Farmington Milk Truck Company, be and it is directed and required to continue to accept and transport milk consigned to the Schier Branch of The City Dairy Company and Ditch Brothers and deliver same to the plants of said Schier Branch of The City Dairy Company and Ditch Brothers, in the City of Baltimore, so long as the said respondent shall continue to operate as a common carrier under permit of this Commission.

ORDER No. 4098.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of THE BALTIMORE DRY DOCKS AND SHIPBUILDING COMPANY		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1456.
CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE		

WHEREAS, The Baltimore Dry Docks and Shipbuilding Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, complainant, having complained to this Commission that the respondent, Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, has demanded that said complainant sign a supplemental contract submitted by said respondent whereby the complainant obligates itself to deposit with the respondent \$36,166.10 to defray the cost of additional supply lines necessary to serve complainant with electric service at 13,200 volts, 25 cycle, 3 phase, said deposit, without interest, to be returned to the complainant in five annual installments, if the service be continued for the full period of five years, otherwise the complainant shall pay the full initial cost, as stated above, together with the cost of removal of lines, less salvage on the sale of cable and material, or the respondent shall have the option of retaining the line and returning to the complainant the unrefunded portion of the initial deposit, and

WHEREAS, The case being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that the additional supply line or lines should properly be paid for and financed by the respondent,

• IT IS, THEREFORE, This 25th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the respondent, the said Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, be and it is hereby directed

and required to forthwith proceed with the construction of such additional supply line or lines as may be necessary and sufficient in order to adequately supply the complainant with high-tension electric energy at the several shipyards or plants of the complainant, in the City of Baltimore, said supply line or lines to be constructed at the expense of the respondent and to be completed and ready for the supply of electric energy not later than sixty days from the date of this order.

FURTHER Ordered, That copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission within ten days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4099.

In the Matter of

The Petition of WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 782 Publishing Tidewater Demurrage Rules and Regulations Covering Cars Containing Coal, Anthracite and Bituminous, and Coke, Held for Trans-shipment at Port Covington, Baltimore, Maryland, Which Said Tariff Now Stands Suspended Until February 8th, 1918, Under Authority of This Commission's Circular No. 10G, Canceling Said Suspension as of February 7th, 1918.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 492.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 28th day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Western Maryland Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 782 publishing tidewater demurrage rules and regulations covering cars containing coal, anthracite and bituminous, and coke, held for trans-shipment at Port Covington, Baltimore, Maryland, which said tariff now stands suspended until February 8th, 1918, under

authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10G, canceling said suspension as of February 7th, 1918.

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4099 of date January 28th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4102.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of THE PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

vs.

THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, a Body Cor-
porate, with Respect to the "Skip-Stop"
Plan of Operating Its Cars.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1378.

This case having this day come on for further hearing in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4091 entered January 22nd, 1918, and an oral opinion having been rendered by the Commission, through its Chairman, wherein the conclusion was reached that certain stops heretofore eliminated by the respondent company under its so-called "skip-stop" plan of operation should be restored,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 30th day of January, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the respondent, said The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, be and it is hereby directed and required to restore, on or before February 9th, 1918, regular stops for passengers desiring to board or alight from the cars of the respondent company, at the following points:

NORTH AVENUE LINE

North and Thomas Avenues.

North Avenue and Wolfe Street.

GARRISON BOULEVARD LINE

Garrison and Springdale Avenues.

Garrison and Forest Avenues.

Garrison and Boarman Avenues.

Garrison Avenue and Chatham Road.

EDMONDSON AVENUE LINE

- Monument and Bond Streets.
- Bloomington Road and Baker Street.
- Chelsea and Clifton Avenues.
- Lyndhurst and Clifton Avenues.

WOODLAWN LINE

Liberty Heights Avenue and Forest Path.
Liberty Heights Avenue and Hillsdale Road.

ORDER No. 4105.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of HARVEY R. SPESSARD, Attorney,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1464.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, It appears from the papers filed in this case, and particularly from the letter of the Complainant filed herein on the date hereof, that the complaint has been satisfied,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This thirty-first day of January, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the said complaint be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4106.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permis- sion Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 938, Establishing Rates on Manure, Carloads, from Camp Meade, Mary- land to Points on Maryland and Penn- sylvania Railroad.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 493.</p>
--	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this first day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 938, establishing rates on manure, carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to points on Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad; said rates to apply to the points and be the same as rates shown in petitioner's Exhibit "A," filed herein,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4106 of date February 1st, 1918."

ORDER No. 4107.

In the Matter of

The Application of PATAPSCO AND BACK RIVERS RAILROAD COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving a Change in the Location of a Part of Its Line.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1466.

WHEREAS, It appears from the petition and exhibit filed in the above entitled matter that the proposed change in the location of Patapsco and Back Rivers Railroad is necessary and convenient for the public service, and this Commission having decided, after investigation, that a hearing in this case is not necessary under the terms and provisions of Section 26 of the Public Service Commission Law,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This first day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the change of location, as set forth in the above application and more particularly shown on the blueprint filed therewith, be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4108.

In the Matter of

The Petition of Railroads Operating Within the State of Maryland for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Freight Tariffs to Become Effective on February 10th, 1918, Changing Demurrage Rules, Regulations and Charges in Compliance with Order No. 7 of the Director General of Railroads and to Cancel as of January 21st, 1918, Tariffs Hitherto Filed with the Commission Changing Demurrage Rules, Regulations and Charges Intended to Have Become Effective on Said Date.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 494.

WHEREAS, This Commission by its Order No. 4070 entered on January 10th, 1918, permitted all railroads operating within the State of Maryland to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, freight tariffs to become effective on January 21st, 1918, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges in compliance with Order No. 3 of the Director General of Railroads, and

WHEREAS, Under authority of this Commission's Order No. 4070 aforesaid tariffs were filed with this Commission to become effective on the date indicated changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges in intended compliance with Order No. 3 of the Director General of Railroads, which said tariffs have, so far as same contain rules, regulations and charges applicable to the transportation of freight in interstate commerce, and were filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, been rejected by said Interstate Commerce Commission, for the reason that said tariffs do not in fact meet the requirements of Order No. 3 of the Director General of Railroads, and

WHEREAS, The Director General of Railroads has by his Order No. 7 dated January 29th, 1918, required railroads under his jurisdiction to establish and make effective on February 10th, 1918, demurrage rules, regulations and charges, so as to provide:

"A. (1) Forty-eight hours (two days) free time for loading or unloading on all commodities.

(2) Twenty-four hours (one day) free time on cars held for any other purpose permitted by tariffs.

"B. That the average agreement rule be permitted, but that it apply solely to cars held for unloading.

"C. That under the average rule the number of days on which debits accrue be made four instead of five.

"D. That the demurrage charge on all cars, after the expiration of the free time allowed, be \$3 for each of the first four days, \$6 for each of the next three days and \$10 for each succeeding day.

"E. That the bunching rule be reinstated with the following change in Paragraph 2:

"Cars for unloading or reconsigning. When, as the result of the act or neglect of any carrier, cars originating at the same point or at intermediate points moving via the same route and destined for one consignee, at one point, are bunched at originating point, in transit, or at destination, and delivered by the carrier in accumulated numbers in excess of daily shipments, the consignee shall be allowed such free time as he would have been entitled to had the cars been delivered in accordance with the daily rate of shipment. Claim to be presented to carriers' agent within fifteen (15) days.

"These charges will supersede all those named in any existing tariffs applicable to carload freight, except:

"1. Cars loaded with live stock.

"2. Empty cars placed for loading coal at mines or mine sidings, or coke at coke ovens, and cars under load at mines or mine sidings or coke at coke ovens.

"3. Foreign export freight awaiting ships at ports.

"4. Coal for trans-shipment at tidewater or lake ports.

"5. Empty private cars stored on railroad or private tracks, provided such cars have not been placed or tendered for loading on the order of a shipper;

and specifically contemplate the cancelation of all conflicting provisions of existing tariffs," and

WHEREAS, Application has now been made to this Commission upon behalf of all railroads operating within the State of Maryland for permission under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to file and publish on less than statutory notice freight tariffs to become effective on February 10th, 1918, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges in compliance with Order No. 7 of the Director General of Railroads, as hereinbefore set forth, and to cancel as of January 21st, 1918, tariffs hitherto filed with the Commission under authority of its Order No. 4070 aforesaid, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges intended to have become effective on said date, and

. WHEREAS, After due consideration it appears that said application is reasonable and proper and should be granted, it is this first day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given to all railroads operating within the State of Maryland in whose behalf said application has been made to this Commission, to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public:

(1) Freight tariffs to become effective on February 10th, 1918, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges in compliance with Order No. 7 of the Director General of Railroads, as hereinbefore set forth.

(2) Cancellation as of January 21st, 1918, of tariffs hitherto filed with the Commission under authority of its Order No. 4070 aforesaid, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges intended to have become effective on said date,

PROVIDED, That tariffs containing said rules, regulations and charges and providing for said cancellation shall be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order, and shall be published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4108 of date February 1st, 1918."

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That all tariffs or supplements canceling the tariffs hitherto filed with the Commission under authority of its Order No. 4070 aforesaid, changing demurrage rules, regulations and charges intended to have become effective on January 21st, 1918, shall stipulate that charges which may have been imposed or collected under said canceled tariffs will be adjusted to the basis of charges which would have accrued under demurrage tariffs effective immediately prior to January 21st, 1918,

AND IT IS FURTHER Ordered, That by passing this order the Public Service Commission is not to be taken as in any sense whatever approving any rules, regulations or charges that may be filed under the authority of this order; all such rules, regulations and charges being left as fully subject to investigation and correction on complaint, or on the Commission's own motion under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law as if this order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4109.

In the Matter of

The Joint Application of MARYLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated January 28th, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Certain Telephone Facilities.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1467.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this fourth day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4110.

In the Matter of

The Petitions of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY and WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioners' Freight Tariffs Publishing Tidewater Demurrage Rules and Regulations Covering Cars Containing Coal and Coke, Held for Trans-shipment at Baltimore Terminals.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 495.

The above mentioned petitions having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 4th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company and Western Maryland Railway Company

to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioners' freight tariffs publishing tidewater demurrage rules and regulations covering cars containing coal and coke, held for transshipment at Baltimore terminals; said rules and regulations to be the same as shown in Fifteenth Section Order No. 303 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, copy of which order is filed herein marked Exhibit "A," and which said order was entered by the Interstate Commerce Commission at the request of the Director General of Railroads,

PROVIDED, Said tariffs containing said rules and regulations be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4110 of date February 4th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4114.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Passenger Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 486 Establishing Parlor-Cafe Car Seat Fares Between Points in the State of Maryland Intermediate to Wheeling and Martinsburg, West Virginia.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 496.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 5th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be and is hereby given The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on three days' notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's passenger tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 486 establishing parlor-cafe car seat fares between points in the State of Maryland intermediate to Wheeling and Martinsburg, West Virginia; said fares to apply between the points and be the same as fares shown in specimen copy of said tariff, filed herein as exhibit,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said fares be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4114 of date February 5th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4115.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Cancellation of Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 866 Covering Tidewater Demurrage Rules and Regulations on Cars Containing Coal and Coke, Held for Trans-shipment at Baltimore Terminals.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 497.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 6th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, cancellation of petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 866, covering tidewater demurrage rules and regulations on cars containing coal and coke, held for trans-shipment at Baltimore terminals; said cancellation to be effective as of February 8th, 1918,

PROVIDED, Tariff effecting said cancellation be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4115 of date February 6th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4116.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated November 15th, 1917, with CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Two Poles on Cairnes Lane, Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1470.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It Is, THEREFORE, On this seventh day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4117.

In the Matter of

The Petition of Railroads Operating Within the State of Maryland for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Revised Rules, Regulations and Charges Governing Diversion and Reconsignment of Carload Traffic.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 498.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 7th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, railroads operating within the State of Maryland to file and publish on one day's

notice to the Commission and the public, revised rules, regulations and charges governing diversion and reconsignment of carload traffic; said revised rules, regulations and charges to be the same as those contemporaneously established on interstate traffic and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with that Commission's opinion in I. & S. Docket No. 1050,

PROVIDED, Tariffs containing said rules, regulations and charges be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4117 of date February 7th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4118.

In the Matter of

The Petition of WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Cancellation of Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 782 Covering Tidewater Demurrage Rules and Regulations on Cars Containing Coal and Coke, Held for Trans-shipment at Baltimore Terminals.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 499.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 7th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be, and is hereby given, Western Maryland Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, cancellation of petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 782, covering tidewater demurrage rules and regulations on cars containing coal and coke, held for trans-shipment at Baltimore terminals; said cancellation to be effective as of February 8th, 1918.

PROVIDED, Tariff effecting said cancellation be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4118 of date February 7th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4119.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Schedules of Toll Rates for Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, and U. S. Filling Plant, Edgewood, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 500.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 7th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, schedules of toll rates for "Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland," and "U. S. Filling Plant, Edgewood, Maryland,"

PROVIDED, Said schedules containing said toll rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedules shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4119 of date February 7th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4120.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>BETHLEHEM STEEL COMPANY, Complainant,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON RAILROAD COMPANY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>BALTIMORE AND SPARROWS POINT RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendants.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 501.</p>
--	---	--

REPARATION CLAIM \$1,153.67.

This is a petition filed by Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, by H. C. Clevenger, its Coal Freight Agent, and joined in by Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company by the same official, on behalf of Bethlehem Steel Company, complainant, for permission to refund unto said complainant that portion of freight bills rendered and collected from Maryland Steel Company, predecessor of said complainant, by said railroad companies which is in excess of a just and reasonable charge upon shipments of pyrites cinder between points on defendants' lines within the State of Maryland.

The petition sets forth that between June 1st, 1916 and September 30th, 1916, shipments were made, consigned to Maryland Steel Company, predecessor of the complainant herein, over the railroads of the defendant companies from Canton Station, Baltimore, Maryland, to Sparrows Point, Maryland, of 124 carloads of pyrites cinder aggregating 12,305,750 pounds, on which were charged rate of 53 cents per 2,240 pounds, as per tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 375, issued by The Pennsylvania Railroad Company and concurred in by the defendant companies. Shipments moved over Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad from Canton Station to Colgate Creek, Maryland, and thence over Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad to destination.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company on August 28th, 1916, filed with this Commission Supplement No. 10 to its freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 375 aforesaid, effective October 1st, 1916, making rate on pyrites cinder, carloads, from Pennsylvania Railroad Baltimore stations to Sparrows Point 32 cents per 2,240 pounds and it is on basis of this subsequently established rate that application is now made to refund.

The complainant claims and the defendants admit that the rate

lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipments moved was under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of 32 cents per 2,240 pounds, as set forth in Supplement No. 10 to P. R. R. freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 375, would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipments in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 8th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company and said Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Bethlehem Steel Company, the sum of \$1,153.67, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$2,911.63, for the 124 carloads aggregating 12,305,750 pounds, based on rate of 53 cents per 2,240 pounds and the amount properly chargeable, \$1,757.96, at the rate of 32 cents per 2,240 pounds, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipments in question.

FURTHER Ordered, That unless otherwise ordered by this Commission the present rate of 32 cents per 2,240 pounds on pyrites cinder, carloads, from Canton Station, Baltimore, Maryland, to Sparrows Point, Maryland, shall be maintained as maximum for a period of one year from the date of this order.

ORDER No. 4121.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated January 11th, 1918, with THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Six Poles Located in the City of Baltimore Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26th, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1471.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary.

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this eighth day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4122.

In the Matter of

The Application of LIBERTY HEIGHTS BUS COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Discontinuance of Its Service Between Gwynn Oak Junction and Howardsville via Liberty Heights Avenue, Villa Nova and Campfield Road.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1465.

This case having come on for hearing on February 6th, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4103 passed January 30th, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission having determined after due hearing that the operation by the applicant of its automobile transportation service between Gwynn Oak Junction and Howardsville, via Liberty Heights Avenue, Villa Nova and Campfield Road is no longer necessary or convenient for the public service, in view of the fact that said service has been furnished at a considerable loss to the applicant,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the abandonment and discontinuance of the automobile transportation service of the applicant, said Liberty Heights Bus Company, between Gwynn Oak Junction and Howardsville via Liberty Heights Avenue, Villa Nova and Campfield Road, be and they are hereby permitted and approved, effective on and after the date hereof.

lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipments moved was under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of 32 cents per 2,240 pounds, as set forth in Supplement No. 10 to P. R. R. freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 375, would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipments in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 8th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company and said Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Bethlehem Steel Company, the sum of \$1,153.67, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$2,911.63, for the 124 carloads aggregating 12,305,750 pounds, based on rate of 53 cents per 2,240 pounds and the amount properly chargeable, \$1,757.96, at the rate of 32 cents per 2,240 pounds, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipments in question.

FURTHER Ordered, That unless otherwise ordered by this Commission the present rate of 32 cents per 2,240 pounds on pyrites cinder, carloads, from Canton Station, Baltimore, Maryland, to Sparrows Point, Maryland, shall be maintained as maximum for a period of one year from the date of this order.

ORDER No. 4121.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated January 11th, 1918, with THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Six Poles Located in the City of Baltimore Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26th, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1471.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary.

It Is, THEREFORE, On this eighth day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4122.

In the Matter of

The Application of LIBERTY HEIGHTS BUS COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Discontinuance of Its Service Between Gwynn Oak Junction and Howardsville via Liberty Heights Avenue, Villa Nova and Campfield Road.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1465.

This case having come on for hearing on February 6th, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4103 passed January 30th, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission having determined after due hearing that the operation by the applicant of its automobile transportation service between Gwynn Oak Junction and Howardsville, via Liberty Heights Avenue, Villa Nova and Campfield Road is no longer necessary or convenient for the public service, in view of the fact that said service has been furnished at a considerable loss to the applicant,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the abandonment and discontinuance of the automobile transportation service of the applicant, said Liberty Heights Bus Company, between Gwynn Oak Junction and Howardsville via Liberty Heights Avenue, Villa Nova and Campfield Road, be and they are hereby permitted and approved, effective on and after the date hereof.

ORDER No. 4123.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$10,284,384.63 of Its Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds, Series A.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1460.

WHEREAS, The Commission on January 24th, 1918, entered an order approving the issue and sale or pledge of \$10,284,384.63 of Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds of The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company for the uses and purposes recited in said order, and said company has made a Supplemental Application in this proceeding setting out that it desires to exercise its right to substitute all or a part of said bonds for certain shares of Reading Company stock as provided in a certain Trust Agreement dated July 2nd, 1917, between said company and the United States Mortgage & Trust Company, Trustee, under which Trust Agreement there have been issued, with the approval of the Commission, \$15,000,000 of Five Per Cent. Secured Gold Notes, and it has been deemed advisable that the approval of this Commission to the specific pledge under said Trust Agreement be had in addition to the general approval of the pledge of said bonds given by said order of January 24th, 1918; and the Commission being of opinion that the use of the capital to be secured by the pledge of such bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation;

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 11th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That said company may substitute \$10,000,000 of said Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds, or a part thereof, for all or a pro-rata proportion of each class of Reading Company stock now pledged with the United States Mortgage & Trust Company, Trustee, under a Trust Agreement dated July 2, 1917, to secure \$15,000,000 of Five Per Cent. Secured Gold Notes of said company.

ORDER No. 4124.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated December 3rd, 1917, with the Commissioners of Aberdeen, Maryland, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of 15 Poles Located in the Town of Aberdeen, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1472.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this eleventh day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4126.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff AA—P. S. C. Md. No. 68.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 502.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 11th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff AA—P. S. C. Md.

No. 68 establishing switching rate of 40 cents per 2,240 pounds on bituminous coal, carloads, from junction with Western Maryland Railway, at Fulton Junction, Baltimore, and from junction with Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, at Bay View Junction, Baltimore, to stations on Pennsylvania Railroad in Baltimore, as shown in specimen copy of said tariff AA—P. S. C. Md. No. 68, filed herein as exhibit,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

“Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4126, of date February 11th, 1918.”

ORDER No. 4127.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The . Petition of WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 862.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. . S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 503.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 11th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Western Maryland Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 862, amending said petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 778, as follows:

“Eliminate the Exceptions on page 3, and add the following to Rule 8: “Except that on shipments reconsigned between stations in Baltimore switching limits (Arlington, Md., and east thereof) indexed 53 to 5, W. M. Ry. P. S. C. Md. No. 795, return haul charges will be waived and the published tariff rate from point of origin.

To final destination if on the Western Maryland Railway.

To Fulton Jct., Md., when destined to points on or via the Pennsylvania R. R.

Or to Westport, Md., when destined to points on or via the Baltimore & Ohio R. R.

in effect at the time of shipment from point of origin will apply plus reconsignment charges specified in Rules 5 and 6 (A),”

PROVIDED, Said tariff be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

“Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4127 of date February 11th, 1918.”

ORDER No. 4128.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Petition of WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 863.	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	S. N. & R. Docket.
	Case No. 504.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 11th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be, and is hereby given, Western Maryland Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 863, establishing switching rates of 40 cents per 2,240 pounds on bituminous coal, carloads, and of 40 cents per 2,000 pounds on coke, carloads, from junction with Pennsylvania Railroad, at Fulton Junction, Baltimore, and from junction with Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, at Westport, Baltimore, to stations on Western Maryland Railway in Baltimore and adjacent points, as shown in specimen copy of said tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 863, filed herein as exhibit,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

• “Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4128 of date February 11th, 1918.”

ORDER No. 4129.

<p style="text-align: center;">In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Cancellation of Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 813.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 505</p>
--	---	---

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 11th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Western Maryland Railway Company to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, cancellation of petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 813, thereby leaving in effect petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 778, supplements thereto and reissues thereof, to govern the diversion and reconsignment of coal and coke,

PROVIDED, Said cancellation be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said cancellation shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4129 of date February 11th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4131.

<p style="text-align: center;">In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of G. E. BIDDISON for an Order Permitting and Approving the Discontinuance of His Auto Truck Freight Line Between Dublin, Maryland, via Bel Air Road to Baltimore, Maryland.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1469.</p>
---	---	---

This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4112 passed February 5th, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission having determined after hearing that the operation by the applicant of his automobile transportation service between Dublin, Maryland, via Bel Air Road to Baltimore, Maryland, is no

longer reasonably necessary or convenient for the public service, in view of the fact that said service has been furnished at a considerable loss to the applicant.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 12th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the abandonment and discontinuance of the automobile transportation service of the applicant, said G. E. Biddison, between Dublin, Maryland, via Bel Air Road to Baltimore, Maryland, be and they are hereby permitted and approved, effective on and after the date hereof.

ORDER No. 4133.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of DENNIS FITZGERALD,		Public Service Commission
ET AL.,		of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1439.
NORTHERN CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.		

This case having been set for hearing on December 11th, 1917, and having been heard on that date when both parties were represented in person or by counsel, and an oral opinion having been rendered by the Chairman of the Commission in which the conclusion was reached that the Complainants were entitled to relief, and the Respondent Company having agreed to satisfy the complaint in accordance with the findings of the Commission as contained in its oral opinion aforesaid, and the Complainants by Dennis Fitzgerald having informed the Commission by letter this day filed, that the case has been satisfied by the Defendant as agreed,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twelfth day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and it is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4135.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 854, Establishing Rate of \$1.25 per 2,000 Pounds on Brick, Carloads, from Rossville, Maryland, to Aberdeen, Maryland, and Edgewood, Maryland, on the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 506.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 13th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 854, establishing rate of \$1.25 per 2,000 pounds on brick, carloads, from Rossville, Maryland, to Aberdeen, Maryland, and Edgewood, Maryland, on the Pennsylvania Railroad,

PROVIDED, Said supplement containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4135 of date February 13th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4136.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 942.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 507.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 13th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 492, establishing proportional rates of 40 cents per 2,240 pounds on bituminous coal, carloads, and of 40 cents per 2,000 pounds on coke, carloads, from junction with Pennsylvania Railroad, at Bay View Junction, Baltimore, and from junction with Western Maryland Railway, at Westport, Baltimore, to stations on Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in Baltimore and adjacent points, as shown in specimen copy of said tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 942 filed herein and marked Exhibit "A,"

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4136 of date February 13th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4137.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of WILLIAM H. MACKALL, President, Town Commissioners of Elkton,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>MARYLAND WATER COMPANY OF CECIL COUNTY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1381.</p>
---	---	---

WHEREAS, Knowledge has been brought home to the Public Service Commission that at the mortgage foreclosure sale, to which allusion has been made in these proceedings, the property and assets of the Maryland Water Company were purchased by one James H. Alexander, who resides in Baltimore City, in the State of Maryland; and that the sale of the said property and assets to him has been finally ratified and confirmed by the Circuit Court for Cecil County. And,

WHEREAS, It has been suggested to the said Commission that it is expedient (whether necessary or not) to make the said Alexander a party defendant to these proceedings before the final order is passed herein.

Now, THEREFORE, It is this 13th day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the said James H. Alexander be and he is hereby made a party Defendant to these proceedings; and that a copy of the Complaint in these proceedings and of this Order be forwarded to him

at 600 Law Building, Baltimore City, and that the matters complained of be satisfied by him within ten (10) days of the service of said Complaint and Order; with the privilege to the said Alexander to take such further testimony in these proceedings as he may deem advisable, at a hearing to be fixed by the said Commission immediately upon the filing of said answer, unless the taking of such testimony shall be waived by the said Alexander.

ORDER No. 4138.

CAMBRIDGE BOARD OF TRADE	}	Before the
<i>vs.</i>		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
DIAMOND STATE TELEPHONE COMPANY.		Case No. 103.

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

It IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4139.

GEORGE S. M. KEIFFER, ET AL.,	}	Before the
<i>vs.</i>		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.		Case No. 455.

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac

Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

It Is, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND It Is FURTHER **Ordered**, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4140.

ROLAND PARK CIVIC LEAGUE	}	Before the
vs.		Public Service Commission
CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.		of Maryland.
		Case No. 572.

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

It Is, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND It Is FURTHER **Ordered**, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4141.

CARROLL'S ISLAND COMPANY vs. CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 649.
---	---	--

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4142.

RICHARD A. COLE vs. CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 722.
--	---	--

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4143.

J. F. JUENGST	}	Before the
vs.		Public Service Commission
CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.		of Maryland.
		Case No. 791.

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4144.

FREDERICK BOARD OF TRADE	}	Before the
vs.		Public Service Commission
CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.		of Maryland.
		Case No. 800.

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4145.

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN vs. CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 807.
--	---	--

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4146.

THE UNITED AUTO SALES COMPANY, ETC., vs. THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELE- PHONE COMPANY.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1430.
---	---	---

ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION.

It appearing that the matters complained of in the above case are directly involved in the general inquiry now before the Commission in Case No. 690, entitled "In the Matter of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs,"

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above case be and the same is hereby consolidated with said Case No. 690;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That copies of this Order be served upon the respective parties, and that an additional copy thereof be filed in said Case No. 690.

ORDER No. 4148.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of the BALTIMORE DRY DOCK AND SHIPBUILDING COMPANY		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		
CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.		Case No. 1456.

The petition of the respondent for the reopening of the above entitled matter for further hearing having this day come on to be heard in accordance with the Commission's Order No. 4125 entered February 11th, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after hearing upon such petition that same should be granted and the case reopened for further hearing,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 15th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled matter be and it is hereby reopened for further hearing, the further hearing to be held upon such date or dates as may hereafter be determined by the Commission.

ORDER No. 4150.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, a Body Corporate, with Respect to Its Latest Rules in Relation to Gas and Electric Extensions and Service Con- nections.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1476.</p>
--	---	---

Albert G. Towers, E. Clay Timanus and John Milton Reifsnider, members of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, by W. Cabell Bruce, their General Counsel, complaining against the Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Company of Baltimore, a body corporate, duly incorporated under the Laws of Maryland, and engaged in the business both of a "gas corporation" and an "electrical corporation," within the meaning of the Public Service Commission Law of Maryland, say:

1. That Supplement No. 11 P. S. C. Md. G-6 filed by said body corporate with the said Commission on January 2, 1918, effective February 1, 1918, and headed, "rules regarding gas main extensions and service pipe installations," is unjust, unreasonable and unwarrantable; in that

(a) It unjustly, unreasonably and unwarrantably curtails the free allowances and the privileges theretofore made and accorded by the said body corporate to its patrons in the matter of gas main extensions and service connections; and in that

(b) It unjustly, unreasonably and unwarrantably seeks to vest title in the said body corporate to the mains and services mentioned in said Supplement; and in that

(c) It unjustly, unreasonably and unwarrantably requires a deposit to be made in each instance in advance with the said body corporate to meet the entire cost of the gas extensions mentioned in said supplement; and in that

(d) It is subject to other objections which will be more particularly brought forward at the hearing of this complaint.

2. That Supplement No. 24 P. S. C. Md. E-4 filed by the said body corporate with the said Commission on January 2, 1918, effective February 1, 1918, and headed, "information on company's general practice," is unjust, unreasonable and unwarrantable; in that

(a) It unjustly, unreasonably and unwarrantably curtails the free

allowances and the privileges theretofore made and accorded by the said body corporate to its patrons in the matter of electric main extensions and service connections; and in that

(b) It seeks to unjustly, unreasonably and unwarrantably vest in said body corporate the title to the electric mains and services mentioned in said supplement; and in that

(c) It unjustly, unreasonably and unwarrantably requires a deposit in each instance in advance to be made with said body corporate to meet the entire cost of the electric extensions mentioned in said supplement; and in that

(d) It is subject to other objections which will be more particularly brought forward at the hearing of this Complaint.

WHEREFORE, It is this fifteenth day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That a copy of this Complaint and Order be forwarded to the said Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Company of Baltimore, and that the matters complained of be satisfied by said body corporate; or that the charges therein be answered in writing by said body corporate within ten (10) days of the service of this complaint and order.

WM. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

ORDER No. 4151.

In the Matter of	} Before the		
The Petition of THE HAGERSTOWN AND		Public Service Commission of Maryland.	
FREDERICK RAILWAY COMPANY for Per-			S. N. & R. Docket.
mission Under Section 15 of the Public			Case No. 508.
Service Commission Law to File and			
Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice			
Schedule of Revised Gas Rates for			
Frederick, Maryland.			

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed; upon consideration thereof, it is this 18th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, schedule of revised gas rates for Frederick, Maryland, to become effective March 5th, 1918, and

to take the place of schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 39 heretofore filed with the Commission to become effective on said date, the rates under the new schedule to be as follows:

First 2000 cu. ft. per month at \$1.75 per 1000 cu. ft.
 Next 4000 cu. ft. per month at 1.55 per 1000 cu. ft.
 Additional consumption at 1.35 per 1000 cu. ft.
 All subject to a discount of 10c. per thousand cu. ft.
 for prompt payment.

PROVIDED, Said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4151 of date February 18th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4152.

In the Matter of The Investigation of the Regulations, Practices, Equipment, Appliances and Services of the UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1123.
--	---	---

The petition of the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore for certain amendments and modifications of Sections 9, 10 and 14 of Order No. 2890 passed in the above entitled matter on May 29th, 1916, as modified by Order No. 2906 passed on June 13th, 1916, having come on to be heard, and the Commission having concluded as the result of the hearing on said petition that Sections 9 and 10 of said rules should be amended and modified to the extent hereinafter set forth, and that Section 14 of said rules should be rescinded as prayed for by said railways company,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 18th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, Sections 9 and 10 of the rules prescribed by Order No. 2890 of this Commission passed May 29th, 1916, as modified by Order

No. 2906 passed June 13th, 1916, be and the same are hereby modified and amended to read as follows:

SECTION 9. Said United Railways and Electric Company upon all of the tracks regularly operated by it shall operate its cars between the hours of 6 o'clock A. M. and 12 o'clock Midnight (except during the morning and evening rush hours of all week days and after 1 o'clock P. M. Saturday as hereinafter provided for) at such intervals that the cars passing any point outside the business district bounded by Madison and Franklin on the north, Fallsway on the east, Pratt Street on the south and Greene Street on the west, on their routes in each direction during any thirty (30) minute period between said hours shall contain an average number of car seats amounting to one hundred (100) seats for every one hundred (100) passengers carried on said cars passing said point in each direction during said thirty (30) minute period.

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That if less than five (5) cars of any line pass any point at which a check is made during the said thirty (30) minute period, then the aggregate number of seats carried by three (3) consecutive cars in any one direction on any line shall not be less than the aggregate number of passengers carried by the said cars in the same direction.

IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That at no time or place on any line or route operated by the United Railways and Electric Company, except on lines operated outside of present City Limits, shall there be scheduled less than one (1) car during each and every fifteen (15) minute period of the entire twenty-four (24) hours of each day, with the six (6) hours between 12.00 Midnight and 6.00 A. M. excepted.

IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That the United Railways and Electric Company on all week days during the morning and evening rush hours periods, which are defined to be between the hours of 6.00 A. M. and 9.00 A. M. and 4.30 P. M. and 7.00 P. M., and after 1.00 P. M. on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays excepted, shall operate its cars on all lines at such intervals that the cars passing any point on any line in each direction during any thirty (30) minute period between said hours shall contain an average number of car seats amounting to one hundred (100) seats for every one hundred and fifty (150) passengers carried by said point in each direction upon any line during each thirty (30) minute period.

PROVIDED, FURTHER, HOWEVER, That on lines where the average headway is three (3) minutes or less, the cars passing any point on any line in each direction during any fifteen (15) minute period between said hours shall contain an average number of car seats amounting to one hundred (100) seats for every one hundred and fifty (150) passengers carried by said point in each direction upon any line during each fifteen (15) minutes, but under no circumstances shall there be carried on any individual car a greater number of passengers than the maximum prescribed by the Commission. The maximum prescribed for each class of car is as follows:

<i>Car Numbers</i>	<i>Seating Capacity</i>	<i>Standing</i>	<i>Total</i>
Double Truck—			
1501-1575	52	47	99
101-160, 301-365, 401-475, 501-525, 700-768, 1301-1370, 1401-1420, 1701-1725, 1801-1832, 1901-1950, 2501-2525, 2901-2923, 3101-3135	44	40	64
201-265, 601-640.....	46	42	88
1001-1065, 1601-1645.....	36	33	69
Single Truck—			
1-30, 901-926, 2101-2135.....	34	31	65
1201-1249, 2001-2049, 2301-2324, 3001-3025.	30	27	57
2202-2233, 2701-2709.....	25	23	48

Note.—Cars equipped with longitudinal seat in front vestibule are allowed three (3) additional seated passengers.

SECTION 10. Said Railways Company shall operate on Sundays and legal holidays past every point on each of its lines in each direction during each half hour a sufficient number of cars to provide a number of seats at least equal to the number of passengers.

It Is FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That Section 14 of the rules prescribed by Order No. 2890 aforesaid be and it is hereby rescinded.

It Is FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That this order shall become effective on March 1st, 1918.

It Is FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission within five days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4155.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of JOHN F. MARTIN</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1445.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, The above mentioned case having been, by order of the Commission, set for hearing on December 19th, 1917, and having been heard by the Commission on that date, at which hearing both parties were present or represented by counsel, and

WHEREAS, At said hearing the Commission directed its Assistant Engineer to proceed at once to Annapolis that certain differences between the parties might be adjusted by him to the satisfaction of all concerned, and it appearing from the report of the Chief Engineer,

No. 1084, filed herein that such differences were adjusted, as directed, and

WHEREAS, Eugene P. Childs, Esq., Counsel for the Complainant, has filed herein on the date hereof a letter to the Commission admitting satisfaction,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This nineteenth day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled matter be entered upon the docket of this Commission as satisfied.

ORDER No. 4156.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Investigation of the Regulations, Practices, Equipment, Appliances and Services of the UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1123.

WHEREAS, This Commission's Order No. 4152 passed in the above entitled matter on February 18th, 1918, prescribes the maximum number of passengers to be permitted at any time upon cars of the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and

WHEREAS, It is necessary in order to effectively enforce the provisions of said Order No. 4152 restricting the number of passengers permitted upon cars of said railways company at any time that there be displayed at all times in each of said cars placards or signs showing the maximum capacity thereof,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore be and it is hereby directed and required on and after March 1st, 1918, to display in each of the cars operated by it placards or signs, in conspicuous places in each end of such cars, which shall be of sufficient size as to be readable from all points within such cars, to be first approved by the Commission, advising as to the maximum capacity of such cars, which maximum capacity shall be in accordance with the table contained in Order No. 4152 aforesaid, the placards or signs to be in form as follows:

MAXIMUM CAPACITY OF THIS CAR
IS _____ PASSENGERS.

By Order
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND.

March 1st, 1918.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That said United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore shall as promptly as possible submit to the

Commission for its approval specimen copy of such placards or signs, showing the size thereof and the quality of material upon which same are to be printed.

IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission within five days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4172.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated January 19th, 1918, with the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on Collington Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1482.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-fifth day of February, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4174.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>CECIL H. BAGLEY, Complainant,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>MARYLAND AND PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendants.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 509.</p>
--	---	---

REPARATION CLAIM \$53.46.

This is a petition filed by The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company by C. S. Wight, its General Freight Representative, and joined in by the Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad Company by Paul Gessford, its Traffic Manager, on behalf of Cecil H. Bagley, complainant, for permission to refund unto said complainant that portion of freight bills rendered and collected from said complainant by said railroad companies which is in excess of a just and reasonable charge upon shipments of manure between points on defendants' lines within the State of Maryland.

The petition sets forth that on September 16th, 1917, and October 3rd, 1917, shipment of one carload of manure on each date was made consigned to the complainant herein, over the railroads of the defendant companies from Mt. Clare, Baltimore, Maryland, to Fallston, Maryland, the two carloads aggregating 134,260 pounds, on which were charged sixth class rate of 9.5 cents per 100 pounds, as per Supplement No. 7 to freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 646 issued by The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. Shipments moved over the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad from Mt. Clare to North Avenue, Baltimore, and thence over Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad to destination. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad filed with this Commission on October 30th, 1917, effective November 30th, 1917, Supplement No. 10 to its freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 744 making rate on manure, carloads, minimum weight 50,000 pounds, from Mt. Clare, Baltimore, to Fallston, \$1.14 per 2,000 pounds and it is on basis of this subsequently established rate that application is now made to refund.

The complainant claims and the defendants admit that the rate lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipments moved was under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of \$1.14 per 2,000 pounds, as set

forth in Supplement No. 10 to freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 744 issued by The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipments in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 26th day of February, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company and said Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Cecil H. Bagley, the sum of \$53.46, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$129.99, for the two carloads weighing 134,260 pounds, based on rate of 9.5 cents per 100 pounds (including straight overcharge of \$2.44) and the amount properly chargeable, \$76.53, at the rate of \$1.14 per 2,000 pounds, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipments in question.

ORDER No. 4175.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CONSOLIDATED POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and the CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for Permission and Authority to the Former Corporation to Issue \$468,000 of Six Per Cent. Notes, and to Renew All or Any Thereof from Time to Time for a Period of Three Years, and to Issue as Collateral Therefor \$468,000 of First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Bonds Out of a Total Authorized Issue of \$15,000,000, and to Lease Property to Be Acquired or Paid for Out of the Proceeds Thereof for a Term of Twenty-five Years to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and for Permission and Authority to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore to Make Such Lease.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.
Case No. 1481.

WHEREAS, The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore has applied to this Commission for an order authorizing and approving the issue by said corporation of Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Thousand Dollars (\$468,000) of Six Per Cent. Notes, and the successive renewal of all or any part of said issue of notes for a period of three

years from March 1st, 1918, said notes, including renewals, to be issued under an indenture between said corporation, the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and The Fidelity Trust Company as trustee, and also authorizing and approving the issue by said corporation of Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Thousand Dollars (\$468,000) par value of First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Twenty-Year Bonds, to be issued under an indenture heretofore executed by said corporation, by the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and by the Maryland Trust Company as trustee, and to be deposited as collateral to secure said issue of notes, including successive renewals thereof; and

WHEREAS, The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore have applied for an order authorizing and approving a lease by The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore of a proposed new gas holder or any other property acquired or to be acquired with the proceeds of the pledge of any of said bonds, subject to, for the term and upon the terms and conditions of, the existing twenty-five year lease from The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore heretofore authorized and approved by this Commission; and

WHEREAS, After consideration of the said application of The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, and the exhibits filed therewith and thereafter, and after due hearing, the Commission is of the opinion that the use of the capital to be secured by said issue of Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Thousand Dollars (\$468,000) of notes, and of Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Thousand Dollars (\$468,000) of bonds as collateral therefor, is reasonably required for the purposes of The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore as in said application set forth, to wit, for the acquisition of property and for the construction of its plant or distributing system,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 27th day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore be and it is hereby authorized to issue its Six Per Cent. Notes as aforesaid in the amount of Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Thousand Dollars (\$468,000) for the purposes aforesaid, and successively to renew all or any part of said issue of notes for a period of three years from March 1st, 1918, and to issue and deposit as collateral to secure said notes, including renewals, its First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Twenty-Year Bonds in the amount of Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Thousand Dollars (\$468,000).

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That the Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore be and they are hereby authorized to execute, make and carry out a lease by The Consolidated Power Company of

Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore of the aforesaid proposed new gas holder, or any other property acquired or to be acquired with the proceeds of the pledge of any of said bonds, subject to, for the term and upon the terms and conditions of, the existing twenty-five year lease from The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore heretofore authorized and approved by this Commission.

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That the said The Consolidated Power Company of Baltimore shall make reports, verified by affidavits, to this Commission as follows:

(a) Upon the sale for cash of said notes authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such sale or sales and the terms and conditions thereof and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) Upon the issuance, and the deposit thereof as collateral of said bonds authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issuance and deposit and the terms and conditions thereof and the amount realized therefrom.

(c) Upon the consummation of such lease to the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, the fact of such lease and the terms and conditions thereof, including a complete copy thereof.

ORDER No. 4182.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated September 16th, 1913, Between Said Telephone Company and CRISFIELD ICE MANUFACTURING COMPANY for the Joint Use of Poles in the Town of Crisfield, Somerset County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1486.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this fourth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agree-

ment, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4183.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Between Said Company and the WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY for the Purchase by the Former from the Latter of One Hundred and Twenty Poles, Twenty-two Anchor Guys and One Tree Guy Located in District No. 8, Cecil County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1487.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this fourth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4184.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Between Said Company and CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Sale by the Former and Purchase by the Latter of Eighty-eight Poles and Three Anchor Guys Located in the City of Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1488.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this fourth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4186.

In the Matter of

The Application of WILLIAM H. PEARRE for Permission to Operate a Motor Vehicle Between Poplar Springs, Woodbine and Baltimore for Public Use.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1480.

WHEREAS, William H. Pearre having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of a motor vehicle for public use between Poplar Springs, Woodbine and Baltimore, Maryland, and,

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on for hearing in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4164 passed February 21st, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience do not

require the granting of said permit, but that on the contrary the granting of such a permit would be prejudicial to the welfare and convenience of the public,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 5th day of March, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of William H. Pearre in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby, refused and dismissed.

ORDER No. 4187.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of THE NORTHERN NATURAL GAS COMPANY to Change Its Rates on Less Than Thirty Days' Notice to the Commission and the Public.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 510.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 6th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given The Northern Natural Gas Company to file, publish and make effective its rates as shown on schedule marked "P. S. C. Md. No. 4," presented to the Commission for filing on March 5th, 1918, without giving the usual thirty days' notice thereof; said rates to be applicable to all gas consumed subsequent to the February meter readings; the rates shown on the new schedule make reduction in the localities named from the rates now being charged for gas sold by petitioner and shown on the schedule of rates heretofore filed with the Public Service Commission, marked "P. S. C. Md. No. 3,"

PROVIDED, Said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4187 of date March 6th, 1918,"

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That the permission hereby given shall not in any way be taken or deemed to be an approval by the Commission of the justness or reasonableness of the rates shown on said schedule.

ORDER No. 4188.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Petition of THE WEST VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND GAS COMPANY OF MARYLAND to Change Its Rates on Less Than Thirty Days' Notice to the Commission and the Public.	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	S. N. & R. Docket.
	Case No. 511.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 6th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given The West Virginia and Maryland Gas Company of Maryland to file, publish and make effective its rates as shown on schedule marked "Sup. No. 3 to P. S. C. Md. No. 4," presented to the Commission for filing on March 5th, 1918, without giving the usual thirty days' notice thereof; said rates to be applicable to all gas consumed subsequent to the February meter readings; the rates shown on the new schedule make reduction in the localities named from the rates now being charged for gas sold by petitioner and shown on the schedule of rates heretofore filed with the Public Service Commission, marked "P. S. C. Md. No. 4,"

PROVIDED, Said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4188 of date March 6th, 1918,"

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That the permission hereby given shall not in any way be taken or deemed to be an approval by the Commission of the justness or reasonableness of the rates shown on said schedule.

ORDER No. 4189.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Petition of the WEST VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND GAS COMPANY to Change Its Rates on Less Than Thirty Days' Notice to the Commission and the Public.	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	S. N. & R. Docket.
	Case No. 512.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 6th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given West Virginia and Maryland Gas Company to file, publish and make effective its rates as shown on schedule marked "Sup. No. 3 to P. S. C. Md. No. 7," presented to the Commission for filing on March 5th, 1918, without giving the usual thirty days' notice thereof; said rates to be applicable to all gas consumed subsequent to the February meter readings; the rates shown on the new schedule make reduction in the localities named from the rates now being charged for gas sold by petitioner and shown on the schedule of rates heretofore filed with the Public Service Commission, marked "P. S. C. Md. No. 7,"

PROVIDED, Said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4189 of date March 6th, 1918,"

PROVIDED FURTHER, That the permission hereby given shall not in any way be taken or deemed to be an approval by the Commission of the justness or reasonableness of the rates shown on said schedule.

ORDER No. 4194.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY for the Approval of the Certification and Delivery of Three Hundred and Eighty-seven (387) of Its First Mortgage, Five Per Cent. Thirty-Year Gold Bonds of the Par Value of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000) Per Bond, Etc.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1474.

The petition of the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company and exhibit filed therewith, and the testimony and evidence offered in support thereof, and all proceedings having been read and considered, and it appearing to the Public Service Commission of Maryland that the permission and approval asked for in said petition are proper, and the granting of the same would be convenient for the public service, and the Commission being of the opinion that the use of capital secured by the certification, issue and delivery of the bonds hereinafter mentioned and authorized to be certified, issued and delivered is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation;

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of March, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company is hereby authorized to receive from the Cleveland Trust Company, as Trustee under the First Mortgage Deed of Trust from the said Railroad Company dated March 1st, 1911, three hundred and eighty-seven (387) bonds, numbered five thousand, two hundred and ninety-six (5,296) to five thousand and six hundred and eighty-two (5,682), both numbers inclusive, of an issue of First Mortgage, Five Per Cent. Thirty Year Gold Bonds, of the aggregate par value of Seven Million, Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$7,500,000) secured by said First Mortgage Deed of Trust, the said three hundred and eighty-seven (387) bonds being a portion of the bonds of said issue reserved for certification, issue and delivery, for the purposes of the enlargement, betterment, extension of or additions to the properties covered by the said First Mortgage Deed of Trust, and the said Cleveland Trust Company as Trustee is hereby authorized to certify and deliver the said three hundred and eighty-seven (387) bonds to the said Railroad Company, the same to be received by the said Railroad Company as reimbursement for the enlargement, betterment, extension of or additions to the property covered by the said First Mortgage Deed of Trust amounting to Four Hundred and Sixty-five Thousand, Seven Hundred and Ninety-nine Dollars and Ninety-seven Cents (\$465,799.97), as set forth in an exhibit filed with said petition and marked "Exhibit of Expenditures for the Enlargement, Betterment, etc., from January 1st, 1916, to December 31st, 1917," less deductions of Six Hundred and Seventy-four Dollars and Fifty-one Cents (\$674.51), and One Hundred and Five Dollars (\$105) respectively, making Four Hundred and Sixty-five Thousand and Twenty Dollars and Forty-six Cents (\$465,020.46), and also as reimbursement for the sum of Three Hundred and Eighty-five Dollars and Seventeen Cents (\$385.17), expended in acquisitions and permanent improvements made prior to January 1st, 1916, and not covered by the bonds heretofore authorized by this Commission, so that after the delivery of said bonds there will remain a credit of One Thousand and Five Dollars and Sixty-three Cents (\$1,005.63) on bonds to be certified in the future; said three hundred and eighty-seven (387) bonds when so certified, issued and delivered to the said Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company, to be and become and to be treated as bonds in the treasury of said Company, with full power and authority of said Company, acting through its duly authorized officers, or Board of Directors, from time to time, to sell or pledge said bonds, or any of them, for such prices or loans as to said officers or Board may seem proper, judicious or expedient.

~~Ordered~~, FURTHER, That said Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company shall make reports, duly verified by affidavit, to this Commission as follows:

(a) Upon the issue or sale of said bonds hereby authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue or sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

ORDER No. 4196.

In the Matter of

The Joint Petition of GEORGE C. BOUNDS AND COMPANY and SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Sale by the Former to the Latter and the Purchase by the Latter from the Former All of the System for Distributing Electricity for Light, Heat and Power Now Owned and Heretofore Operated by Said GEORGE C. BOUNDS AND COMPANY in the Town of Hebron, Wicomico County, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1478.

WHEREAS, George C. Bounds and Company and the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company have applied for the written consent of the Commission to the conveyance by the former and the acceptance by the latter of all the system for distributing electricity for light, heat and power in the town of Hebron, Wicomico County, Maryland, now belonging to George C. Bounds and Company; and

WHEREAS, The Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company has asked for the permission and approval of the Commission to exercise the rights and privileges under the franchise granted to it by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County bearing date December 18th, 1917, for the purpose of enabling it to operate the distributing system conveyed to it by George C. Bounds and Company as aforesaid; and

WHEREAS, The Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company has asked for an order of the Commission authorizing it to issue its note payable three years after date for \$600, to the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company for the purpose of enabling it to acquire the said distributing system; and

WHEREAS, This case having come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4162 passed February 21st, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the conveyance by George C. Bounds and Company and the acceptance by the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company of all the system for distributing electricity for light, heat and power in the town of Hebron, Wicomico County, Maryland,

now belonging to said George C. Bounds and Company, and the exercise by the said Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company of all of the rights and privileges under the franchise granted to it by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, copy of which said franchise is filed herein as part of the application, are necessary and convenient for the public service, and that the use of the capital to be secured by the issuance of the said note by the said Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company is reasonably required for the said purposes of said company,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 9th day of March, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the permission and approval of the Commission be and are hereby given to the conveyance by George C. Bounds and Company and the acceptance by the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company of all the system for distributing electricity for light, heat and power in the town of Hebron, Wicomico County, Maryland, now belonging to George C. Bounds and Company, in consideration of the promissory note of the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company for the sum of \$600, payable in three years after date.

2. That the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company be and is hereby permitted to exercise the rights and privileges granted to it under the resolution of the County Commissioners of Wicomico County adopted at their meeting on December 18th, 1917.

3. That the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company is authorized to issue to the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company its promissory note for \$600, payable three years after date, for the purpose of obtaining from the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company its similar note to be used for the acquisition from George C. Bounds and Company of the system for distributing electricity for light, heat and power in the town of Hebron.

ORDER No. 4200.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of CONSOLLATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Thirty Days' Notice Supplements Nos. 26 and 27 to Petitioner's Electric Rate Schedule.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 513.</p>
---	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 12th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

101

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby, given Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, Supplements Nos. 26 and 27 to petitioner's electric rate schedule P. S. C. Md. E No. 4 amending schedules T and T-2, so as to make it clearly appear that the prices stated in fuel rate adjustment clause originally published in Supplements Nos. 16 and 17 to said electric rate schedule P. S. C. Md. E No. 4 and effective on January 1st, 1918, are net and are not subject to discount of 10 per cent. where 25 cycle service is supplied,

PROVIDED, Said supplements be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplements shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4200 of date March 12th, 1918."

FURTHER Ordered, That by passing this Order the Public Service Commission is not to be taken as in any sense whatever approving any rates, charges or regulations that may be contained in the supplements filed under authority of this order; all such rates, charges and regulations being left as fully subject to investigation and correction on complaint or on the Commission's own motion under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law as if this Order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4201.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

against

THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT
AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, a
Body Corporate, with Respect to the
Fairness and Reasonableness of Cer-
tain Industrial Power Rates.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1492.

Albert G. Towers, E. Clay Timanus and John M. Reifsnider, members of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, by Wm. Cabell Bruce, their General Counsel, complaining against The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, a body corporate,

duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Maryland, and engaged in the business of an "Electrical Corporation," within the State of Maryland, say:

That the rates and charges charged and collected by said Company under the provisions of Supplement No. 17 to Schedule T-2, headed "Industrial Power Fixed Charge Rates, etc.," of its tariff schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4, are excessive, unjust and unreasonable.

WHEREFORE, It is this thirteenth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That a copy of this complaint and order be forwarded to the said Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and that the matters complained of be satisfied by said body corporate or that the charges therein be answered in writing by said body corporate within ten (10) days of the service of this complaint and order.

ORDER No. 4204.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 476.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 514.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 14th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby, given The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 476, to amend Rule 6 of said tariff so as to extend the Baltimore lighterage limits to include Float Bridge of Ordnance Department, U. S. A., Curtis Bay, Maryland.

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4204 of date March 14, 1918."

ORDER No. 4205.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE, CHESAPEAKE AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 368.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 515.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 14th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby, given The Baltimore, Chesapeake and Atlantic Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 368, to become effective on April 11th, 1918, and to supersede said petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 366, previously filed with the Commission to become effective on said date, and correcting clerical error appearing in said tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 366 as shown in specimen copy of said tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 368, filed herein as exhibit,

PROVIDED, Said tariff be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4205 of date March 14th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4206.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated January 30th, 1918, with THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY for the Joint Use of Poles Located in District No. 9, Wicomico County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1493.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the

purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It IS, THEREFORE, On this fifteenth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4209.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Valuation of the Plant of the WASHINGTON COUNTY WATER COMPANY.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1496.

WHEREAS, By Chapter 58 of the Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland passed at the legislative session of 1918 and approved March 16, 1918, to take effect from the date of its passage as an emergency law, it was provided, among other things, that this Commission should place a valuation upon the plant of the Washington County Water Company as of March 1, 1918, said valuation to be made the basis of a prospective sale of said plant to the Mayor and Council of Hagerstown if approved by a majority of the stockholders of said Company and as well by a majority of the qualified voters of Hagerstown at the regular election to be held March 25, 1918, or at a special election to be held in said city not later than May 1, 1918;

AND WHEREAS, Prior to the passage of said Act, but in anticipation thereof, this Commission has caused an appraisal to be made of the plant of said Company by the Commission's engineering department and an examination of the books of said Company to be made by the Commission's Auditor, and is, therefore, prepared to proceed with the task of ascertaining and determining its valuation of said plant;

AND WHEREAS, The duly constituted representatives of both said Company and the Mayor and City Council of Hagerstown have requested that said valuation be ascertained and determined not later than Tuesday, March 19th, 1918, in order that the five days' published notice may be given as required by the provisions of said Act prior to the regular election to be held March 25, 1918;

It IS, THEREFORE, this 16th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the matter of the valuation of the plant of said Hagerstown Water Company for the purposes hereinbefore recited

be and the same is hereby set for public hearing before the Commission on Monday, March 18, 1918, beginning at the hour of 10 A. M.;

2. That the Mayor of Hagerstown and the proper representatives of said Hagerstown Water Company be forthwith notified of the objects, purposes, date and hour of said hearing to the end that they may attend the same in person or by their duly constituted representatives if they so desire.

ORDER No. 4211.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplements to Petitioner's Freight Tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 744 and 763, Removing the Suspension as of March 25th, 1918, Now Standing Against Supplement No. 8 to P. S. C. Md. No. 744 and Supplement No. 15 to P. S. C. Md. No. 763, Which Said Supplements Were Originally Filed with the Commission to Become Effective September 16th, 1917, and September 11th, 1917, Respectively, and Now Standing Suspended Until June 30th, 1918, Under Authority of the Commission's Circular No. 10-G.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 516.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 18th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, Supplements to petitioner's freight tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 744 and 763, removing the suspension as of March 25th, 1918, now standing against Supplement No. 8 to P. S. C. Md. No. 744 and Supplement No. 15 to P. S. C. Md. No. 763, which said supplements were originally filed with the Commission to become effective September 16th, 1917, and September 11th, 1917, respectively, and now standing suspended until June 30th, 1918, under authority of the Commission's Circular No. 10-G,

PROVIDED, Said supplements be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplements shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4211 of date March 18th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4212.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of SUDBROOK PARK IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION</p> <p><i>vs.</i></p> <p>SUDBROOK DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1394.</p>
--	---	--

WHEREAS, On the 14th day of December, in the year 1917, an Order, namely Order No. 3994, was passed by the Public Service Commission requiring the Sudbrook Development Company to adopt and put into operation the recommendations made by the Chief Engineer of the Commission in his report No. 1059 mentioned in said Order. And,

WHEREAS, The said Order has been criticised in certain formal respects;

NOW, THEREFORE, In confirmation of said Order, it is hereby, this eighteenth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland ordered as follows:

1. That the higher of the two tanks mentioned in the proceedings in the above entitled matter be forthwith put into operation and service by the said Company; and that the lower of the said two tanks be maintained in reserve by it.

2. That an automatic valve be forthwith established and maintained by the said Company in such a manner that the supply of water in one of the said two tanks may be switched to the other as conditions may from time to time render desirable.

3. That the vertical boiler mentioned in said proceedings be forthwith placed in a good state of serviceable and permanent repair.

4. That an additional valve be forthwith installed and be thereafter maintained in the suction pipe of the emergency pump at the field well mentioned in said proceedings.

5. That occasional inspections be made from time to time by the said Company of the interior of the steam cylinder of the deep well pump mentioned in said proceedings in order to promptly detect and catch up in time any loosening of the piston on its rod.

6. That a sufficient length of new pipe be forthwith procured and laid by the said Company to reduce the loop in the distribution system of the said Company mentioned in said proceedings to the form of a ring.

7. That the water plant of the said Company be hereafter operated by two labor shifts instead of one, as at present, so as to make sure of a continuous supply of water to the patrons of said Company.

8. That plans be matured and presented by the said Company to the said Commission on or before the 18th day of April, in the year 1918, to augment the sources from which said Company now obtains its supply of water to a sufficient extent to meet the probable increased requirements of the future.

AND IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ~~Ordered~~, That this Order shall take effect at once, and shall continue in force until the purposes contemplated by it have been gratified or fulfilled.

ORDER No. 4214.

In the Matter of
The Valuation of the Plant of the
WASHINGTON COUNTY WATER
COMPANY.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.
Case No. 1496.

The above cause having come to be heard, and the duly constituted representatives of the Mayor and Council of Hagerstown and the Washington County Water Company having waived their right to be present at such hearing, the proceedings in said cause, including the reports of the Chief Engineer and Auditor of the Commission, were duly read and considered;

IT IS THEREUPON, This 18th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, 1. That the Commission's valuation of the plant of the said Washington County Water Company as of March 1, 1918, is One Million, One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$1,150,000), this valuation including all of said Company's real and personal property, materials and supplies, rights, privileges, waters, streams of water, watercourses, easements and franchises, excepting its cash funds in hand and in bank, bills and accounts receivable and prepaid taxes, which latter excepted items are to be reserved by the Company, it being understood that the above valuation is made upon the assumption that the Company will at its own cost and expense liquidate all its outstanding current liabilities, including interest accrued on its funded and unfunded debts, customers' deposits, bills and accounts payable, and also its funded debt unless the same be assumed by the

Mayor and Council of Hagerstown as a part of the purchase price of said plant, as provided by section eleven of Chapter 58 of the Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland passed at the session of 1918.

2. That copies of this order be forthwith transmitted to the Mayor and Council of Hagerstown and the proper representatives of said Hagerstown Water Company.

ORDER No. 4215.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of Common Carriers Operating Within the State of Maryland for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Freight Tariffs Effecting Increases in Freight Rates.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 427.

WHEREAS, Various common carriers operating within the State of Maryland some time since filed with the Public Service Commission of Maryland special supplements to freight tariffs proposing to increase, effective July 1st, 1917, rates and charges on Maryland intrastate traffic in effect on said July 1st, 1917, to the amount of 15 per cent., the form of such special supplements being permitted by this Commission's Order No. 3627, entered May 2nd, 1917, and

WHEREAS, Like special supplements to freight tariffs proposing to increase freight rates and charges on interstate traffic were contemporaneously filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and

WHEREAS, The Interstate Commerce Commission after investigation and hearing originally permitted increases in class rates to substantially the extent shown, but refused to permit the increases in commodity rates, except in the case of certain specified commodities, and

WHEREAS, The Public Service Commission of Maryland by its Order No. 3749 entered herein on July 6th, 1917, permitted common carriers in the State of Maryland to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public tariffs containing an increase not exceeding 15 per cent. in class rates applicable to the transportation of Maryland intrastate traffic, and

WHEREAS, Common carriers in the State of Maryland filed with the Commission tariffs increasing the class rates applicable to the transportation of Maryland intrastate traffic in accordance with permission granted by the Commission's Order No. 3749 aforesaid, and at the same time canceled or suspended special supplements thereto-

fore filed with the Commission proposing an increase of 15 per cent. in commodity rates applicable to the transportation of Maryland intrastate traffic, and

WHEREAS, The Interstate Commerce Commission has by its order dated March 12th, 1918, permitted carriers to increase on five days' notice to the Commission and the public the commodity rates on cement, lumber and forest products by one cent per 100 pounds, and commodity rates, other than on ice, bituminous coal, coke and iron ore, not otherwise covered by said order, and which have not been increased since June 27th, 1917, by 15 per cent., observing established rate groupings, relationships and differentials, and

WHEREAS, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, by William Ainsworth Parker, its General Attorney, has, on behalf of all railroads and other common carriers publishing Maryland intrastate freight rates, made application to this Commission for permission under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission to file and publish on less than statutory notice tariffs increasing commodity rates applying on Maryland intrastate freight traffic to the same extent as permitted and authorized on commodity rates applicable to the transportation of interstate traffic by order entered by the Interstate Commerce Commission on March 12th, 1918, and

WHEREAS, It appears that said carriers desire to have said increased intrastate freight rates become effective on the same date on which said increased interstate rates shall become effective for purpose of simplicity, and in order to avoid confusion incident to having two sets of tariffs in the hands of said carriers' agents at the same time; one for interstate and another for intrastate traffic, and

WHEREAS, After due consideration it appears that the application of said carriers is reasonable and proper, and should be granted, it is this 20th day of March, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given to all the common carriers in the State of Maryland, in whose behalf said application has been made to this Commission, to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public tariffs increasing the commodity rates, applicable to transportation of Maryland intrastate freight traffic, on cement, lumber and forest products by one cent per 100 pounds, and commodity rates, other than on ice, bituminous coal, coke and iron ore, and which have not been increased since June 27th, 1917, by 15 per cent., observing established rate groupings, relationships and differentials, even though by so doing some rates are increased slightly more than 15 per cent.,

PROVIDED, That tariffs containing said rates shall be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order, and shall be published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4215 of date March 20th, 1918."

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That by passing this order the Public Service Commission is not to be taken as in any sense whatever approving any rates that may be filed under the authority of this order; all such rates being left as fully subject to investigation and correction on complaint, or on the Commission's own motion under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law as if this order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4217.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplements to Petitioner's Freight Tariffs CC—P. S. C. Md. Nos. 134 and 109.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 517.</p>
---	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 21st day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be, and is hereby given The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 134, removing the suspension as of March 25th, 1918, now standing against Supplements Nos. 14 and 16 to said tariff, the effective date of which supplements has heretofore been postponed until June 30th, 1918, under authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10-G; and supplement to petitioner's freight tariff CC—P. S. C. Md. No. 109, canceling the rates proposed by Supplement No. 15 to said tariff on mine material, the effective date of which rates has heretofore been postponed until June 30th, 1918, under authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10-G,

PROVIDED, Said supplements be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplements shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4217 of date March 21st, 1918."

ORDER No. 4218.

In the Matter of The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAIL- ROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Com- mission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supple- ments to Petitioner's Freight Tariffs GO—P. S. C. Md. Nos. 392, 411 and 418.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 518.
---	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 21st day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplements to petitioner's freight tariffs GO—P. S. C. Md. Nos. 392, 411 and 418, removing the suspension as of March 25th, 1918, now standing against the rates on live stock and fresh meats published in Supplement No. 14 to GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 392, Supplement No. 11 to GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 411 and GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 418, the effective date of which rates has heretofore been postponed until July 13th, 1918, under authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10-G,

PROVIDED, Said supplements be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplements shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4218 of date March 21st, 1918."

ORDER No. 4219.

In the Matter of The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAIL- ROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Com- mission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supple- ments to Petitioner's Freight Tariffs GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 411.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 519.
---	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 21st day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 411, removing the suspension as of March 25th, 1918, now standing against the rates on grain and grain products published in Supplement No. 11 to said tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 411, the effective date of which rates has heretofore been postponed until July 29th, 1918, under authority of this Commission's Circular No. 10-G,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4219 of date March 21st, 1918."

ORDER No. 4220.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of C. C. WATERS & SON		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY.		Case No. 1491.

WHEREAS, It appears from the letter of the Complainants filed herein on the date hereof, withdrawing their complaint, the same having been satisfied by the Defendant,

It Is, THEREFORE, This twenty-first day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That said complaint be entered as satisfied.

ORDER No. 4224.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON RAILROAD COMPANY for an Order Authorizing It to Issue \$1,000,000 of Bonds to Be Secured by the Existing First Mortgage of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, Dated February 1, 1904, Under the Provisions Thereof.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1494.

The Petition and Application of The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company for an Order authorizing it to issue One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) of Bonds to be secured by the existing First Mortgage of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, dated February 1, 1904, under the provisions thereof, for the purposes in said Petition set out, having been filed with the Commission on the 15th day of March, 1918, coming on to be heard in accordance with the Order of the Commission setting the same for hearing on the 21st day of March, 1918, at 1 o'clock P. M.; and it appearing to the Commission that due publication of said Order setting this matter for hearing has been made in accordance with said Order, and it further appearing to the Commission, from the Petition and Exhibits filed therewith, and from the evidence submitted at the hearing, and the Commission having determined therefrom, that the things for which their authority is asked are proper and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 21st day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company be, and the same is hereby, authorized to issue One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) of Bonds under the terms of and to be secured by the existing First Mortgage dated February 1, 1904, of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company to Morton Trust Company, its successors and assigns, heretofore filed with the Commission in Case No. 122, for the purpose of enabling the said The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company to reimburse itself for the funds expended by it in paying off and retiring the One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) of Debenture Bonds of Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad Company, dated April 1, 1887, and which fell due and were paid on April 1, 1917, as in said Petition set out, and to sell and dispose of the same at the best price that it can obtain and secure therefor; the use of the money to be secured by the issue of said Bonds, in the opinion of the Commission, being reasonably required for the purposes aforesaid.

FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That said The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company shall make reports, duly verified by affidavit, to this Commission, upon the issue or sale of said bonds hereby authorized and approved, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue or sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

ORDER No. 4223.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated January 28th, 1918, with THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY for the Sale by the Former and the Purchase by the Latter of Eleven Poles Located in Canton, District No. 12, Baltimore County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1181.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1497.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-first day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4225.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON RAILROAD COMPANY and of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for an Order Authorizing the Former Company to Issue 68,000 Shares of Its Capital Stock, Par Value of \$50 Per Share, the Proceeds Thereof to Be Appropriated and Applied Toward the Discharge of Its Indebtedness to The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and Authorizing the Latter Company to Acquire Its Proportionate Share of Said 68,000 Additional Shares, It Being a Present Stockholder in the Former Company.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1495.

The Joint Petition and Application of The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company and of The Pennsylvania Railroad Company for an Order authorizing the former Company to issue 68,000 shares of its authorized Capital Stock of the Par Value of \$50.00 per share, the proceeds thereof to be appropriated and applied toward the discharge of its indebtedness to The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and authorizing the latter Company to acquire its proportionate share of said 68,000 additional shares, it being a present Stockholder in the said The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, having been filed with the Commission the 15th day of March, 1918, coming on to be heard in accordance with the Order of the Commission setting the same for hearing on the 21st day of March, 1918, at 1 o'clock P. M.; and it appearing to the Commission that due publication of said Order setting this matter for hearing has been made in accordance with said Order, and it further appearing to the Commission, from the Petition and Exhibits filed therewith, and from the evidence submitted at the hearing, and the Commission having determined therefrom, that the things for which their authority is asked are proper and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 21st day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company be, and the same is hereby authorized to issue Sixty-eight Thousand (68,000) shares of its Capital Stock at the Par Value of Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) per share, amounting in the aggregate to Three Million, Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$3,400,000.00), and to apply the proceeds thereof to the liquidation in part of its indebted-

ness to The Pennsylvania Railroad Company which is set out in Paragraph 5 of the Petition and Application filed in this case; and it is hereby

FURTHER Ordered, That The Pennsylvania Railroad Company be, and it is hereby authorized to subscribe for and to acquire its pro rata share of said 68,000 shares of the Capital Stock of The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company at the Par Value of \$50.00 per share; the use of the Capital to be secured by the issue of said stock, in the opinion of the Commission, being reasonably required for the purposes aforesaid,

FURTHER Ordered, That said The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company shall make reports, duly verified by affidavit, to this Commission, upon the issue or sale of said stock hereby authorized and approved, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue or sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

ORDER No. 4227.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of THE WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. No. 867.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 520.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 23rd day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given Western Maryland Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 867, to amend Rule 6 of petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 856 so as to extend the Baltimore lighterage limits to include Float Bridge, Ordnance Depot, U. S. A., Curtis Bay, Maryland,

PROVIDED, Said tariff be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4227 of date March 23rd, 1918."

ORDER No. 4228.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of NORTHERN VIRGINIA POWER COMPANY, Successor of Cacapon Power Company, for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of a Franchise Granted Said Cacapon Power Company by the Town of Hancock, Maryland.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1317.</p>
---	---	---

WHEREAS, Application having been made to this Commission for the transfer by the Cacapon Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of West Virginia, to the Northern Virginia Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Virginia, of all of the rights, privileges and franchises heretofore exercised in the State of Maryland by the said Cacapon Power Company and permitting and approving the exercise by the said Northern Virginia Power Company of all of the rights, privileges and franchises heretofore exercised in the State of Maryland by said Cacapon Power Company, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on for hearing on May 17, 1917, and the Commission, through its Chairman, having rendered an oral opinion wherein the conclusion was reached that certain improvements in the physical property of the company should be made before the permission and approval of the Commission would be given to the transfer as prayed for, and

WHEREAS, It now appears that the requirements set forth in the oral opinion aforesaid have been complied with, as more particularly set forth in Report No. 1102 of the Chief Engineer of the Commission dated March 13, 1918,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-third day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, 1. That the transfer by the Cacapon Power Company of the rights, privileges and franchises heretofore exercised in the State of Maryland by said Company to the Northern Virginia Power Company be and the same is hereby permitted and approved;

2. That the exercise by said Northern Virginia Power Company of all of the rights, privileges and franchises heretofore exercised in the State of Maryland by the said Cacapon Power Company be and it is hereby permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4229.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of S. R. COHILL, <i>et al.</i> ,		Public Service Commission
<i>vs.</i>		of Maryland.
NORTHERN VIRGINIA POWER COMPANY.		Case No. 1821.

WHEREAS, At hearing in the above entitled matter on May 17, 1917, an oral opinion was rendered by the Commission, through its Chairman, wherein the conclusion was reached that certain improvements should be made by the respondent company in its physical property, and

WHEREAS, It now appears that the requirements set forth in the oral opinion aforesaid have been complied with, as more particularly set forth in Report No. 1102 of the Chief Engineer of the Commission dated March 13, 1918,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-third day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be and it is hereby entered as satisfied.

ORDER No. 4230.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS		Public Service Commission
ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY		of Maryland.
OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an		Case No. 1499.
Agreement with THE CHESAPEAKE AND		
POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BAL-		
TIMORE CITY, Dated February 12th,		
1918, for the Sale by the Former to the		
Latter of One Pole Located in the Rear		
of No. 1406 Baltimore Street, Balti-		
more, Maryland, Under the Terms and		
Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered		
July 26th, 1916, in Case No. 1151.		

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-sixth day of March, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4234.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated January 31st, 1918, Between Said Telephone Company and CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Joint Use of One Pole Located in District No. 1, Baltimore County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1502.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-seventh day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4235.

In the Matter of	}	
The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Tariff Establishing Freight Rate of 70 Cents Per 2,000 Pounds on Cinder, Carloads, from Baltimore, Maryland, to Annapolis, Maryland.		Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 521.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 27th day of March, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, tariff establishing freight rate of 70 cents per 2,000 pounds on cinder, carloads, from Baltimore, Maryland, to Annapolis, Maryland, in connection with Maryland Electric Railways Company,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4235 of date March 27th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4239.

In the Matter of	}	
The Application of WILLIAM B. STALEY for a Permit to Operate a Motor Vehicle for Public Use Between Hagerstown and Frederick, Maryland.		Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1485.

WHEREAS, William B. Staley having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of motor vehicles for public use between Hagerstown, Maryland, and Frederick, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on for hearing on March 6th, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4180 passed

March 1st, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience do not require the granting of said permit, but that on the contrary the granting of such a permit would be prejudicial to the welfare and convenience of the public, in view of the fact that the passenger train service now provided between Hagerstown and Frederick by The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company reasonably accommodates the passenger traffic between said points, and in view of the further fact that the curtailment in the passenger revenues of said The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company which would result if the permit prayed for be issued would seriously affect the net earnings of said railway company,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 28th day of March, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of William B. Staley in this case exhibited be and the same is hereby refused and dismissed.

ORDER No. 4242.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement with the SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY, Dated September 28th, 1917, for the Joint Ownership by Said Companies of 76 Poles in the Town of Salisbury, Wicomico County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2918, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131 Before This Commission.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1503.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this first day of April in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4244.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, a Body Corporate, in Respect to the Fair- ness and Reasonableness of Certain Industrial Power Rates.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1492.</p>
--	---	---

Albert G. Towers, E. Clay Timanus and John Milton Reifsnider, members of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, by Wm. Cabell Bruce, their General Counsel, complaining against the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, a body corporate, duly incorporated under the Laws of the State of Maryland, and engaged in the business of "an electrical corporation" within the State of Maryland, say, by way of amendment to their complaint against the said Company filed herewith on the thirteenth day of March, in the year 1918:

1. That the rates and charges charged and collected by said Company under the provisions of certain supplements to its tariff schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4; namely, Supplement No. 18, to schedule U, headed "permanent railway power generating rates," Supplement No. 19 to Schedule S, headed "industrial rates, general service," Supplement No. 20 to Schedule S-2, headed "fixed rate power, general service," Supplement No. 26 to Schedule T, headed "industrial power rates, high tension transmission line service," and Supplement No. 27 to Schedule T-2, headed "industrial power fixed charge rates, high tension transmission line service," are excessive, unjust and unreasonable, and discriminatory.

2. That the rates and charges charged and collected by the said Company under the provisions of the paper writing, dated April 18, 1910, purporting to be a contract for electrical current for the period of ten years between the said Company and the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company, and mentioned by the said first mentioned company in the memorandum of charges for electric service filed by it with the said Commission on July 29, 1910, are unlawful, unjust, unreasonable and discriminatory.

WHEREFORE, It is this second day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That copies of this amended complaint and order be forwarded to the said Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Com-

pany of Baltimore, and the said Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company, and that the matters complained of be satisfied by the said bodies corporate, or that the charges therein be answered in writing by the said bodies corporate within five (5) days of the service of this complaint and order.

ORDER No. 4245.

In the Matter of
The Petition of the NORTHERN NATURAL
GAS COMPANY to Change Its Rates on
Less Than Thirty Days' Notice to the
Commission and the Public.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.
S. N. & R. Docket.
Case No. 522.

The above named petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be and is hereby given the Northern Natural Gas Company to file, publish and make effective its rates as shown on schedule marked "Supp. No. 1 to P. S. C. Md. No. 4," presented to the Commission for filing on April 1, 1918, without giving the usual thirty days' notice thereof; said rates to be applicable to all gas consumed subsequent to April 1, 1918. The only rates now effective are the Class "A" and "B" rates of said company, the latter being applicable to public schools, courthouses, large hospitals and public and charitable institutions. The new schedule makes the Class "A" rates applicable to all consumers except those enumerated under Class "B" and makes a reduction in the price of the excess of 200,000 cubic feet delivered each month to any consumer, with the proviso that no consumer will be served in excess of 200,000 cubic feet each month during the months of November, December, January, February and March, and that such consumers during the other months will be cut off without notice in order to provide adequate service to consumers using gas for the ordinary domestic and household and heating and lighting purposes.

This order to become effective provided said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4245 of date April 2nd, 1918."

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That the permission hereby given shall not in any way be taken or deemed to be an approval by the Commission of the justness or reasonableness of the rates shown on said schedule.

ORDER No. 4246.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of the WEST VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND GAS COMPANY OF WEST VIRGINIA to Change Its Rates on Less Than Thirty Days' Notice to the Commission and the Public.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 523.

The above named petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given the West Virginia and Maryland Gas Company of West Virginia to file, publish and make effective its rates as shown on schedule marked "Supp. No. 4 to P. S. C. Md. No. 7," presented to the Commission for filing on April 1, 1918, without giving the usual thirty days' notice thereof; said rates to be applicable to all gas consumed subsequent to April 1, 1918. The only rates now effective are the Class "A" and "B" rates of said Company, the latter being applicable to public schools, courthouses, large hospitals and public and charitable institutions. The new schedule makes the Class "A" rates applicable to all consumers except those enumerated under Class "B" and makes a reduction in the price of the excess of 200,000 cubic feet delivered each month to any consumer, with the proviso that no consumer will be served in excess of 200,000 cubic feet each month during the months of November, December, January, February and March, and that such consumers during the other months will be cut off without notice in order to provide adequate service to consumers using gas for the ordinary domestic and household and heating and lighting purposes.

This order to become effective provided said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4246 of date April 2nd, 1918."

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That the permission hereby given shall not in any way be taken or deemed to be an approval of the Commission of the justness or reasonableness of the rates shown on said schedule.

ORDER No. 4247.

In the Matter of The Petition of the WEST VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND GAS COMPANY OF MARYLAND to Change Its Rates on Less Than Thirty Days' Notice to the Commission and the Public.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 524.
---	---	---

The above named petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given the West Virginia and Maryland Gas Company of Maryland to file, publish and make effective its rates as shown on schedule marked "Supp. No. 4 to P. S. C. Md. No. 4," presented to the Commission for filing on April 1, 1918, without giving the usual thirty days' notice thereof; said rates to be applicable to all gas consumed subsequent to April 1, 1918. The only rates now effective are the Class "A" and "B" rates of said company, the latter being applicable to public schools, courthouses, large hospitals and public and charitable institutions. The new schedule makes the Class "A" rates applicable to all consumers except those enumerated under Class "B" and makes a reduction in the price of the excess of 200,000 cubic feet delivered each month to any consumer, with the proviso that no consumer will be served in excess of 200,000 cubic feet each month during the months of November, December, January, February and March, and that such consumers during the other months will be cut off without notice in order to provide adequate service to consumers using gas for the ordinary domestic and household and heating and lighting purposes.

This order to become effective provided said schedule containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this order and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4247 of date April 2nd, 1918."

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That the permission hereby given shall not in any way be taken or deemed to be an approval by the Commission of the justness or reasonableness of the rates shown on said schedule.

ORDER No. 4256.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of C. WARNER STORK and
JOHN W. STORK, Trustees of Estate of
William L. Stork,

vs.

CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND
POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1498.

The above cause having been previously set for hearing and having been heard on the date hereof, when both parties were represented in person or by counsel, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the complainants are not entitled to the relief for which they have prayed,

It IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of April, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

ORDER No. 4257.

In the Matter of

The Application of the UNION RAILROAD
COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and THE
PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for
an Order Approving the Lease of the
Railroad, Franchises and Property of
the Union Railroad Company of Baltimore to The Pennsylvania Railroad
Company for the Term of 991 Years
and 9 Months from April 1, 1918.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1504.

The joint petition and application of the Union Railroad Company of Baltimore and The Pennsylvania Railroad Company for an order approving the lease of the railroad and franchises and property of the Union Railroad Company of Baltimore to The Pennsylvania Railroad Company for the term of Nine Hundred and Ninety-one (991) years and Nine (9) months from April 1, 1918, upon the terms and conditions and stipulations set forth in the Agreement of Lease dated

March 13, 1918, between said corporations, duly executed and acknowledged, a certified copy of which lease is filed with the application and petition in this case, marked "Exhibit A," coming on to be heard in accordance with the order of the Commission setting the same for hearing on the 8th day of April, 1918, at 2 o'clock P. M.; and it appearing to the Commission that due publication of said order setting this matter for hearing has been made in accordance with said order, and it further appearing to the Commission from the petition and application and the exhibit filed therewith, and from the evidence submitted at the hearing, and the Commission having determined therefrom, that the things for which its approval is asked are proper and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the permission and approval of the Public Service Commission of Maryland are hereby given to the lease by and between the Union Railroad Company of Baltimore and The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, dated March 13, 1918, by which the Union Railroad Company of Baltimore leases to The Pennsylvania Railroad Company its railroad, property and franchises therein described and mentioned for the term of nine hundred and ninety-one (991) years and nine (9) months from April 1, 1918, upon the terms and conditions and stipulations therein set forth, a certified copy of said Lease duly executed and acknowledged by the parties thereto having been filed in these proceedings, marked "Exhibit A."

ORDER No. 4259.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between Said Company and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located in a Private Alley in the Rear of No. 835 North Patterson Park Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26th, 1916.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1505.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the

Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this eighth day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4260.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE TOLCHESTER BEACH
IMPROVEMENT COMPANY for Permission
Under Section 15 of the Public Service
Commission Law to File and Publish
on Less Than Statutory Notice Supple-
ments to Petitioner's Local Freight
Tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 38, 39, 40
and 41.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 525.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 9th day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given The Tolchester Beach Improvement Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplements to petitioner's freight tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 38 and 39 to become effective April 16th, 1918, and supplements to petitioner's freight tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 40 and 41 to become effective April 19th, 1918, reducing the rate on fertilizer applying between Baltimore and landings specified in said tariffs from \$2.50 per net ton to \$2.25 per net ton.

PROVIDED, Said supplements containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplements shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4260 of date April 9th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4262.

In the Matter of	
The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND	} Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1378.
vs.	
THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, a Body Cor- porate, with Respect to the "Skip-Stop" Plan of Operating Its Cars.	

WHEREAS, The co-operation of this Commission has been sought by the Special War Committee of the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners, by the Conservation Division of the United States Fuel Administration and by the Fuel Administrator for Maryland in the matter of the conservation of fuel by the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and it has been represented that a great saving in the consumption of fuel by said Company would result were said Company authorized and empowered by this Commission to put into effect what is commonly known as the "Staggered-Skip-Stop" plan of operation on its lines in Baltimore City, and the counties contiguous thereto in which it operates; and

WHEREAS, This Commission is satisfied that the general adoption of said "Staggered-Skip-Stop" plan of operation on the lines of said Company during the continuance of the war in which our country is now engaged will result in a material saving in the consumption of fuel which is greatly needed for other industries and purposes if said war is to be waged to a successful conclusion, and that such saving will far more than counterbalance any reasonable degree of inconvenience which may be caused the general public or individual members thereof by the adoption of said plan;

IT IS, THEREFORE, ~~Ordered~~, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland this 9th day of April, 1918,

1. That the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore be and it is hereby authorized and requested to adopt and put into operation, at the earliest moment reasonably practicable, what is known as the "Staggered-Skip-Stop" plan of operation, upon all the lines operated by it in Baltimore City and in the counties contiguous thereto; subject, however, to the right of this Commission at any time hereafter to modify and change any specific application thereof as an unreasonable exercise of said authority, either upon the Commission's own motion or upon the complaint of any individual or individuals as by law provided;

2. That before said plan is actually put in operation over any specific

line said Company shall file with this Commission the notice and application prescribed by the "Rules of the Public Service Commission of Maryland for the Determination of Street Intersections at which the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore shall not be required to take on or discharge passengers" embodied in Order No. 3832 of this Commission passed September 10, 1917, in this cause, all of which rules, save as next hereinafter modified, shall remain effective and in force as to the "Staggered-Skip-Stop" plan of operation herein authorized and requested;

3. That Rule 1 of the rules aforesaid be and the same is hereby rescinded and revised to read as follows, in which form it shall be effective as fully and to the same extent as though it had originally been embodied in said Order No. 3832, to wit:

"Rule 1. From and after the date of the adoption of these rules the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore shall not designate any street intersection within the corporate limits of Baltimore City or any suburban street or highway crossing at which it has heretofore been accustomed to stop its cars to receive or discharge passengers as a 'non-stop' crossing until it shall have first complied with the provisions of these rules, and shall have caused to be posted conspicuously at all intersections appropriate signs bearing the words 'North Stop,' 'South Stop,' 'East Stop' or 'West Stop,' respectively, visible in the direction from which the cars which are to stop at such intersection approach. *Provided*, however, that the use of signs bearing the words 'Non Stop,' 'No Stop,' 'No Car Stop' or any other words of similar purport may be used in the discretion of the Company to designate non-stop intersections where the method first herein prescribed is not reasonably practicable or does not seem expedient or desirable."

4. That a copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper officers of the respondent Company, and that such Company be required within ten days from the date of such service to notify this Commission whether or not it will accept and abide by the same.

ORDER No. 4263.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated February 16th, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on the North Side of a Private Alley in the Rear of 3011 West North Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26th, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1506.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this 10th day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4264.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated January 22nd, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Fifteen Poles Located on Francis Avenue, East of Rolling Road, Baltimore County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26th, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1507.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this 10th day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4268.

In the Matter of

Annual Reports of Bridge Companies
Subject to the Jurisdiction of the
Public Service Commission.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

WHEREAS, By Chapter 272 of the Acts of 1916 a new section, 1%, was added to the Public Service Commission Law of Maryland, providing that the term common carrier when used in said Act should likewise include all bridges then or thereafter erected over a stream or river dividing two counties in the State of Maryland or between this State and another State, by any corporation authorized to charge and collect toll from persons using the same as foot-passengers, and for vehicular traffic of every kind;

IT IS, THEREFORE, ~~Ordered~~, This eleventh day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, that the Secretary give

notice to all whom it may concern that pursuant to the provisions of Section 21 of the Public Service Commission Law, the Commission—

1. Will require every person and corporation under its supervision owning, operating, managing or controlling any bridge now or hereafter erected over a stream or river dividing two counties in the State of Maryland or between this State and another State and authorized by law to charge and collect toll from persons using the same as foot-passengers, and for vehicular traffic of every kind, to make an annual report to the commission properly verified;

2. Has prescribed the fiscal year ending December 31st, which such annual reports of said persons and corporations must cover;

3. Has prescribed March 31st of each year as the date on or before which all annual reports of said persons and corporations for the preceding fiscal year should be submitted.

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That Form No. 34-B, as submitted to the Commission by the Auditor, and a copy of which is filed in the records of the Commission, be and the same is hereby adopted as the form upon which all corporations and persons owning, operating, managing or controlling a bridge property as aforesaid, shall submit the annual reports for the period presented.

AND WHEREAS, Section 21 of the Public Service Commission Law, in addition to authorizing and empowering the Commission to prescribe the form of annual reports to be made as aforesaid, also provides that the Commission may require common carriers to file periodically reports of earnings and expenses within a specified time and to make specific answers to questions upon which the Commission may need information;

AND WHEREAS, The Commission needs and requires forthwith reports of earnings and expenses of the bridge companies aforesaid for the year ended December 31st, 1917, and specific answers to the questions contained in said blank form of annual report, No. 34-B;

IT IS, THEREFORE, FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland:

1. That the Secretary of the Commission forthwith transmit to each corporation or other person owning, operating, managing or controlling any bridge of the character described in Chapter 272 of the Acts of 1916, a copy of said blank form No. 34-B, the same covering the period of the fiscal year ended December 31st, 1917;

2. That within thirty days from the date of the receipt of such blank form of report for the year ended December 31st, 1917, each corporation or other person owning, operating, managing or controlling any such bridge property shall file with this Commission said annual report for the year ended December 31st, 1917, properly filled out and verified by its proper officers as designated in such blank form of report.

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That a copy of this order be sent with each copy of said blank No. 34-B for the year ended December 31st, 1917, transmitted by the Secretary as required by this Order.

ORDER No. 4269.

In the Matter of

The Inspection and Examination of Accounts, Records and Memoranda Kept by Corporations and Others Subject to the Jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

WHEREAS, By Sections 21 and 25 of the Public Service Commission Law provision is made for the keeping of accounts, records and memoranda by common carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, and similar provisions are made by adoption or specifically in the case of other corporations and individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission;

AND WHEREAS, By Section 25 of said Law it is provided that the Commission may designate any of its officers or employees, who shall thereupon have authority under the order of the Commission to inspect and examine any and all accounts, records and memoranda kept by such corporations; and it appearing that no general order designating any such person has ever been passed;

IT IS, THEREFORE, ~~Ordered~~, This eleventh day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland that the Auditor of this Commission is hereby designated to inspect and examine, from time to time, any and all accounts, records and memoranda kept by corporations and others subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission as required by the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law or by order of this Commission or by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

ORDER No. 4270.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>CHARLES A. SMITH LUMBER Co., Inc., Complainant,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendants.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 526.</p>
--	---	--

REPARATION CLAIM \$9.77.

This is a petition filed by The Pennsylvania Railroad Company by E. P. Bates, its Assistant Freight Traffic Manager, and joined in by Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company by I. E. Ballard, its Freight Traffic Agent, on behalf of Charles A. Smith Lumber Company, Inc., complainant, for permission to refund unto said complainant that portion of freight bill rendered and collected from said complainant by said railroad company which is in excess of a just and reasonable charge upon shipment of baled shavings between points on defendants' lines within the State of Maryland.

The petition sets forth that on August 6th, 1917, shipment of one carload of baled shavings weighing 27,900 pounds was made by the complainant, consigned to itself, over the railroads of the defendant companies from Baltimore, Maryland, to Gambrills, Maryland, on which was charged sixth class rate of 9.5 cents per 100 pounds as per tariff P. R. R. GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 446. Shipment moved over Pennsylvania Railroad from President Station, Baltimore, to Odenton, Maryland, and thence over Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad to destination.

Prior to August 2nd, 1917, the sixth class rate from President Station, Baltimore, to Gambrills was 5.25 cents per 100 pounds; on that date the rate was increased by 15 per cent. and in publishing tariff containing the increased rate same was in error shown as 9.5 cents. Supplement No. 1 to said tariff, filed with the Commission on August 17th, 1917, and effective August 23rd, 1917, reduced the rate to 6 cents per 100 pounds, but the shipment covered by this complaint had moved before the corrected rate became effective.

The complainant claims and the defendants admit that the rate lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipment moved was

under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of 6 cents per 100 pounds as set forth in Supplement No. 1 to tariff P. R. R. GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 446, would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipment in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 15th day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said The Pennsylvania Railroad Company and said Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Charles A. Smith Lumber Company, Inc., the sum of \$9.77, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$26.51, for the carload weighing 27,900 pounds, based on rate of 9.5 cents per 100 pounds and the amount properly chargeable, \$16.74, at the rate of 6 cents per 100 pounds, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipment in question.

FURTHER Ordered, That unless otherwise ordered by this Commission the present rate of 6 cents per 100 pounds on baled shavings, carloads, from President Station, Baltimore, to Gambrills, Maryland, shall be maintained as maximum for a period of one year from August 23rd, 1917, the date on which said rate became effective.

ORDER No. 4274.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of WILLIAM H. MACKALL, President, Town Commissioners of Elkton,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>MARYLAND WATER COMPANY OF CECIL COUNTY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1381.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, James H. Alexander has been made a party Defendant to these proceedings, and has had a copy of the complaint in these proceedings, and of the order making him such party Defendant, duly forwarded to him, and was, by the terms of said order, required to satisfy within a certain time the matters complained of; but was not, by the terms of said order, alternatively required to answer said complaint in writing within a certain time prescribed by said order, and has not, within the time prescribed by said order, or otherwise, satisfied said matters so complained of:

NOW, THEREFORE, It is this 19th day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the said James H. Alexander, in default of satisfaction by him of said matters so complained of, be and he is hereby required to answer in writing said complaint within ten (10) days of the service of this order upon him; with the privilege to the said James H. Alexander to take such further testimony in these proceedings as he may deem advisable, at a hearing to be fixed by the said Commission immediately upon the filing of said answer, unless the taking of such testimony shall be waived by the said James H. Alexander.

ORDER No. 4275.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of WILLIAM H. MACKALL, President, Town Commissioners of Elkton,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>MARYLAND WATER COMPANY OF CECIL COUNTY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1381.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, At the mortgage foreclosure sale, to which allusion has been made in these proceedings, the property and assets of the Maryland Water Company were purchased by one James H. Alexander, who resides in Baltimore City, in the State of Maryland, and has very recently been made a party Defendant to these proceedings:

AND, WHEREAS, The sale of the said property and assets to the said Alexander has been finally ratified and confirmed by the Circuit Court for Cecil County, but no deed of said property and assets has ever been executed and delivered to the said Alexander by W. T. Warburton and W. E. Bonn, the attorneys named in the mortgage which resulted in said foreclosure sale, and by whom said foreclosure sale was made and reported to the Circuit Court for Cecil County:

AND, WHEREAS, No good reason has ever been brought to the attention of the Public Service Commission why said deed of said property and said assets has never been so executed and delivered:

AND, WHEREAS, It has been suggested to the said Commission that it is expedient (whether necessary or not) to make the said W. T. Warburton and W. E. Bonn, attorneys as aforesaid, parties Defendant to these proceedings before the final order is passed herein; the said Maryland Water Company itself having been divested of all said property and assets and being but a mere shell, and none but an equitable title to said property and assets having yet vested in the said Alexander, by reason of the failure of the said Warburton and Bonn, as attorneys as aforesaid, to execute and deliver said deed to him.

Now, THEREFORE, It is this 19th day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the said W. T. Warburton and the said W. E. Bonn be and they are hereby made parties Defendant to these proceedings, and that a copy of the complaint in these proceedings and of this order be forwarded to each of them—to the said W. T. Warburton at Elkton, Md., and to the said W. E. Bonn at 44 Central Savings Bank Building, Baltimore City, Md.—and that the matters complained of be satisfied by them within ten (10) days of the service of the said complaint and order, or that the complaint be answered in writing by them within ten (10) days of the service of said complaint and order; with the privilege to the said W. T. Warburton and W. E. Bonn to take such further testimony in these proceedings as they may deem advisable at a hearing to be fixed by the said Commission immediately upon the filing of said answers, unless the taking of such testimony shall be waived by the said W. T. Warburton and W. E. Bonn.

ORDER No. 4277.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff Establishing Commodity Rates on Manure, Carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to Various Points on Line of Petitioner.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 527.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 20th day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff establishing commodity rates on manure, carloads, from Camp Meade, Maryland, to various points on line of petitioner, as set forth in exhibit filed herein,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4277 of date April 20th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4278.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

vs.

THE JOHN J. CARLIN HEATING COMPANY,
a Body Corporate, with Respect to
Fairness and Reasonableness of Its
Charges.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1440.

In accordance with the opinion this day filed in the above entitled case, it is this twenty-second day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the rates and charges set forth in Schedule No. 2 made and filed with this Commission by John J. Carlin, trading as the John J. Carlin Heating Company, November 19, 1917, to become effective December 20, 1917, are hereby declared to be excessive, unjust and unreasonable;

2. That the fair, just and reasonable rates proper to be charged by the said John J. Carlin, trading as the John J. Carlin Heating Company, for the heating services referred to in said Schedule No. 2 until the further order of this Commission are as follows:

RATES.

For the first 10,000 pounds of steam condensation in any calendar month, a charge of 90 cents per 1,000 pounds; for the second 10,000 pounds of steam condensation in any such calendar month, a charge of 85 cents per 1,000 pounds; for the third 10,000 pounds of steam condensation in any such calendar month, a charge of 80 cents per 1,000 pounds; and for all steam condensation furnished in any calendar month in excess of said first 30,000 pounds, a charge of 75 cents per 1,000 pounds;

3. That Rule No. 1 of the Rules and Regulations set forth in said Schedule No. 2 is hereby approved;

4. That the rates and charges specified in paragraph 1 of this Order, together with Rule No. 1 referred to in paragraph 3 hereof, shall take effect as of December 20, 1917, and all bills for heat furnished prior to that date shall be based upon the rates and charges set forth in Schedule No. 1 filed by the said John J. Carlin, trading as the John J. Carlin Heating Company, on said November 19, 1917, while all bills for heat furnished on and after December 20, 1917, shall be based upon the rates and charges prescribed by this Order;

5. That copies of this Order shall forthwith be served upon counsel of record for the complainants in this cause, and upon the said John J. Carlin, and the said John J. Carlin shall, within ten days from the date of receiving such copy, notify this Commission whether or not he will accept and abide by the same.

ORDER No. 4279.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of MOUNTAIN LAKE PARK ASSOCIATION		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 968.
MOUNTAIN LAKE WATER AND LIGHT COMPANY.		

WHEREAS, By Order No. 2459 entered herein on August 10, 1915, the Commission established certain rates to be charged and collected by said respondent for water furnished by it, and which said rates are by said Order provided to continue in force and effect for a period of five years from and after July 1st, 1915, unless earlier modified or abrogated by this Commission; and,

WHEREAS, Said Mountain Lake Water and Light Company has now petitioned the Commission for authority to reduce the annual minimum charge from Nine Dollars (\$9.00) to Five Dollars (\$5.00) where one outside toilet is the sole service supplied by said water company, and to establish a rate or charge of Forty-eight Dollars (\$48.00) per annum for water furnished to farms by said water company through tap of not more than five-eighths inch in diameter,

IT IS, THEREFORE, Upon consideration of the above mentioned petition, this 22nd day of April, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and is hereby given the Mountain Lake Water and Light Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public supplement to petitioner's tariff schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3, reducing the annual minimum charge from Nine Dollars (\$9.00) to Five Dollars (\$5.00) where one outside toilet is the sole service supplied by said water company, and establishing a rate or charge of Forty-eight Dollars (\$48.00) per annum for water furnished to farms by said water company through tap of not more than five-eighths inch in diameter, said annual farm rate to be applied only to customers of said water company whose aggregate annual

charge at the rates prescribed by this Commission's Order No. 2459 aforesaid exceeds Forty-eight Dollars (\$48.00) per annum,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4279 of date April 22nd, 1918."

ORDER No. 4280.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement with CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Thirteen Poles and Four Anchor Guys Located in District No. 12, Baltimore County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1511.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-second day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4281.

In the Matter of	
The Application of THE BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COM- PANY for Permission to Change and Readjust Its Schedules of Quarterly Minimum Charges or Rates on Metered Water Supply Service.	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 375.

It is this 23rd day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the petition of Edmund McCaffray and others for a rehearing in the above case be and the same is hereby set for hearing on Tuesday, April 30th, 1918, at 10.30 o'clock A. M., and that copies of this Order be forthwith transmitted by the Secretary to the attorneys of record for the petitioners and the proper representatives of the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company.

ORDER No. 4282.

In the Matter of	
The Application of THE HAGERSTOWN AND FREDERICK RAILWAY COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$100,000 Par Value of Its First and Refunding Bonds.	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1510.

The above entitled matter having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4273, passed April 19th, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the issue by the applicant, The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company, of \$100,000 par value of its First and Refunding Mortgage Thirty-Year Sinking Fund Gold Bonds, Six Per Cent. Series, is reasonably required for the purpose of said corporation,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 24th day of April in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the applicant, The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company, be and it is hereby authorized to issue and deliver not exceeding \$100,000, face amount, of its First and Refunding Mortgage Thirty-Year Sinking Fund Gold Bonds, Six Per Cent. Series, and to use the same for collateral purposes as mentioned in said petition, and

with the further right to the said Company to sell and dispose of the said bonds, or any part thereof, at any time, at not less than 95 per cent. of the face value of the same; the proceeds to be applied as in said petition set forth, the Commission having determined that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of said bonds is reasonably required for the purpose of said Company, to wit, the lawful discharge and refunding of its obligations.

It Is FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company shall make reports to this Commission duly verified by affidavits upon the issuance and delivery of said bonds, and if the same are sold, the amount thereof so sold and the price obtained therefor.

ORDER No. 4288.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement with THE CONSOLIDATED POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, Dated January 19th, 1918, for the Joint Ownership of 102 Poles Located in District No. 5, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1512.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It Is, THEREFORE, On this twenty-fourth day of April, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4284.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Rate of \$1.40 Per Net Ton on Brick, Carloads, from Rossville and Champion Brick Works, Maryland, to Perryville, Maryland, Pennsylvania Railroad Delivery.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 528.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 29th day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, rate of \$1.40 per net ton on brick, carloads, from Rossville and Champion Brick Works, Maryland, to Perryville, Maryland, Pennsylvania Railroad delivery,

PROVIDED, Tariff containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4284 of date April 29th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4285.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of THE TOLCHESTER BEACH IMPROVEMENT COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplements to Petitioner's Local Freight Tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 37, 38, 39 40, 41 and 42.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 529.</p>
--	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 29th day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Tolchester Beach Improvement Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplements to petitioner's local freight tariffs P. S. C. Md. Nos. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, reducing the rate on empty jars, in paper cartons, loose, from double first-class rate to 25 cents per 100 pounds between Baltimore, Maryland, and Annapolis, Maryland, and to first-class rate between all other wharves,

PROVIDED, Said supplements containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplements shall bear the follow notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4285 of date April 29th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4286.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of IRVING A. BURALL for Permission to Discontinue the Operation of Motor Service for Public Use Between New Market and Frederick, Maryland.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1513.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, It appears from the records of this Commission that Irving A. Burall, the applicant in these proceedings, was permitted under Order No: 3486 of this Commission, dated the twenty-sixth day of February, 1917, to operate and did operate a motor vehicle for

public use between Frederick and New Market in Frederick County, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The said Irving A. Burall has applied to this Commission for permission to discontinue the operation of said motor vehicle for public use and has assigned as a reason therefor the fact that he has been ordered by the duly accredited officers of the United States Government to report for service in the Army of the United States, and therefore is unable any longer to operate said motor vehicle for public use under his permit from this Commission, and

WHEREAS, It appears that one Roy Hoffman has made application for permission to operate a motor vehicle for public use between Frederick and New Market in Frederick County, Maryland, and that said application has this day been granted by Order No. 4291 of this Commission,

NOW, THEREFORE, In consideration of the foregoing statement, it is this thirtieth day of April, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled application be, and it is hereby, granted and that the applicant, the said Irving A. Burall, is hereby permitted to cease operating a motor vehicle for public use between Frederick and New Market in Frederick County, Maryland, the Commission being of the opinion that such operation is no longer necessary and convenient for public use.

ORDER No. 4293.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 476.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 530.</p>
--	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 1st day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 476, increasing the rate of insurance on grain stored in Canton Elevator, Baltimore, Maryland, from 25 cents per \$100 per annum to 27.5 cents per \$100 per annum.

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4293 of date May 1st, 1918."

ORDER No. 4294.

In the Matter of The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permis- sion Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 977.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 531.
--	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this first day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 977, to correct clerical error appearing in said tariff by changing the rates on cinders from Hagerstown and Brunswick to Security to read in cents per 2,000 pounds instead of cents per 100 pounds as in error shown in said tariff,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4294 of date May 1st, 1918."

ORDER No. 4297.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of A. J. OLDENBURG		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.		Case No. 1501.

WHEREAS, It appears from the papers filed in this case and particularly from the letter of the attorney for the complainant filed herein on the date hereof that the complaint has been satisfied;

It Is, THEREFORE, This sixth day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That said complaint be entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4299.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Permis- sion Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 1025.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 532.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 8th day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 1025, reducing the rate on crushed stone, carloads, from Havre de Grace to Aberdeen, Edgewood and Magnolia, Maryland, from \$1.30 per 2,000 pounds as published in said tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 1025 to become effective June 3rd, 1918, to \$1.20 per 2,000 pounds, said reduced rate to become effective one day after filing with the Commission.

PROVIDED, Said supplement containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4299 of date May 8th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4300.

In the Matter of	
JESSUPS AND MOORE PAPER COMPANY, Complainant,	
vs.	
WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY	
and	
PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASH- INGTON RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendants.	
	Before the
	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	S. N. & R. Docket.
	Case No. 533.

REPARATION CLAIM \$52.56.

This is a petition filed by Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company, by I. E. Ballard, its Auditor of Freight Accounts, and joined in by Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company by E. P. Bates, its Assistant Freight Traffic Manager, on behalf of Jessups and Moore Paper Company, complainant, for permission to refund unto said complainant that portion of freight bill rendered and collected from said complainant by said railroad companies which is in excess of a just and reasonable charge upon shipment of pulp wood between points on defendants' lines within the State of Maryland.

The petition sets forth that on December 21st, 1916, shipment of two carloads of pulp wood weighing 92,200 pounds was made, consigned to the complainant herein, over the railroads of the defendant companies, from Crownsville, Maryland, to Elkton, Maryland, on which was

charged sixth class rate of 13.7 cents per 100 pounds as per Pennsylvania Railroad freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. 814. Shipment moved over Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad from Crownsville to Odenton, Maryland, and thence over Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad to destination.

On September 15th, 1917, the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company filed with the Commission its joint freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 63, to become effective October 15th, 1917, publishing rate of \$1.60 per 2,000 pounds on pulp wood, carloads, from Crownsville to Elkton, and it is on basis of this subsequently established rate that adjustment is now proposed.

The complainant claims and the defendants admit that the rate lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipment moved was under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of \$1.60 per net ton, as set forth in freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 63, issued by Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company, would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipment in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 13th day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company and said Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Jessups and Moore Paper Company, the sum of \$52.56, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$126.32, for the two carloads aggregating 92,200 pounds, based on rate of 13.7 cents per 100 pounds, and the amount properly chargeable, \$73.76, at the rate of \$1.60 per net ton, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipment in question.

FURTHER Ordered, That unless otherwise ordered by this Commission the rate on pulp wood, carloads, from Crownsville, Maryland, to Elkton, Maryland, shall not exceed \$1.60 per net ton by more than the amount of any general increase in rates authorized by this Commission for a period of one year from the date of this Order.

ORDER No. 4301.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and the TRAPPE ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY for the Joint Use of Poles Located in the Town of Trappe and Territory Surrounding Said Town Within Half Mile of Its Corporate Limits, District No. 3, Talbot County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1515.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this thirteenth day of May, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4307.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Petitioner's Freight Tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 504.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 534.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 15th day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to petitioner's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 504, publishing commodity rates from stations on Pennsylvania Railroad to stations on Baltimore and Ohio Railroad formerly published in Supplements Nos. 23 to 27, inclusive, to petitioner's freight tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 386, which tariff and supplements thereto were canceled by tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 504 aforesaid, the rates published under authority of this order to include an increase of 15 per cent. over the rates formerly carried in the aforesaid supplements to tariff GO—P. S. C. Md. No. 386,

PROVIDED, Said supplement containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4307 of date May 15th, 1918."

ORDER No. 4310.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE MARYLAND UTILITIES COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$75,000 Face Amount of Its Bonds and \$40,000 Par Value of Its Stock for the Acquisition of the Property and Assets, Including the Good Will and Franchises of the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County in So Far as the Same Refers to the Electrical Branch of Said Company and the Real Estate and Buildings of Said Company and of the Latter Company to Transfer the Same and of the Maryland Utilities Company to Exercise a Franchise Granted by Ordinance of the Mayor and Council of Crisfield to the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County and by Said Company Assigned to The Maryland Utilities Company.

**Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.**

Case No. 1415.

WHEREAS, This Commission by the second paragraph of its Order No. 4018 entered herein on December 27th, 1917, provided:

"That the issue and delivery by the said The Maryland Utilities Company of four hundred (400) shares of its capital stock, of the aggregate par value of Forty Thousand Dollars (\$40,000) and Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) of its First Mortgage Six Per Cent. Gold Coupon Bonds, bearing date November 1st, 1917, payable twenty-two years after date, for the acquisition of the property mentioned in the application in this case, to Albert Emanuel, or to any person designated by him, in payment therefor, as in said application prayed, be and the same is hereby authorized and approved;" and

WHEREAS, Petition has now been made to this Commission for a modification of said second paragraph of said Order No. 4018, so as to change the date of issue of said \$75,000 of bonds and the manner of the issue and the date of maturity thereof, and

WHEREAS, After consideration it appears to the Commission that the modification as prayed for is reasonable and proper and should be granted,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 16th day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the second paragraph of Order No. 4018 entered herein by the Commission on December 27th, 1917, be and it is hereby modified and amended so as to read as follows:

2. That the issue and delivery by the said The Maryland Utilities Company of four hundred (400) shares of its capital stock, of the aggregate par value of Forty Thousand Dollars (\$40,000) and Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) of its First Mortgage Gold Coupon Bonds, bearing date July 1st, 1918, Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) thereof to be known as "Series A" and payable July 1st, 1923, Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) thereof to be known as "Series B" and payable July 1st, 1928, and Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) thereof to be known as "Series C" and payable July 1st, 1940, interest on all of said bonds to be payable semi-annually on the first days of January and July, for the acquisition of the property mentioned in the application in this case, to Albert Emanuel, or to any person designated by him, in payment therefor, as in said application prayed, be and the same is hereby authorized and approved;

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That except as modified and amended by this order, Order No. 4018 aforesaid shall remain in full force and effect.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That certified copy of the Mortgage or deed of trust to be executed to secure the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds authorized to be issued by this order be filed with the Commission within thirty days of the date of this order.

ORDER No. 4311.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of CHARLES G. LETTEAU for Permission to Operate a Motor Vehicle Between Abingdon, Harford County, Maryland, and Baltimore, Maryland, for Public Use.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1479.

WHEREAS, Charles G. Letteau having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of a motor vehicle for public use between Abingdon, Harford County, Maryland, and Baltimore, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4163 passed February 21st, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience do not require the granting of said permit, but that on the contrary the granting of such a permit would be prejudicial to the welfare and convenience of the public,

It Is, THEREFORE, This 16th day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the application of Charles G. Letteau in this case exhibited be and the same is hereby refused and dismissed.

ORDER No. 4312.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of the WHITE HALL FARMERS' CLUB AND IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION <i>vs.</i> THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1484.

This case being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that in order that the respondent, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, shall furnish safe and adequate service it is necessary and proper that said respondent

maintain a fire in its station building at Graystone Station, Maryland, at all times when the temperature at said point is 40 degrees Fahrenheit or lower,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 16th day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The Pennsylvania Railroad Company be and it is hereby directed and required to hereafter maintain until the further Order of this Commission a fire in its station building at Graystone Station, Maryland, at all times when the temperature at said point is 40 degrees Fahrenheit or lower.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a certified copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission in writing within ten days of the date service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4313.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE FAST FREIGHT COMPANY for a Permit for the Operation of Three Motor Vehicles for Public Use Between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1514.

WHEREAS, R. C. Chidakel and B. Futrovsky, trading as The Fast Freight Company, having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of three motor vehicles for public use between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia Line, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on for hearing after due notice given in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4287 passed April 30th, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience do not require the granting of said permit, but that on the contrary the granting of such a permit would be prejudicial to the welfare and convenience of the public,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 16th day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of R. C. Chidakel and B. Futrovsky, trading as The Fast Freight Company, in this case exhibited be and the same is hereby refused and dismissed.

ORDER No. 4816.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of JAMES H. CROMWELL		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
MARYLAND ELECTRIC RAILWAYS COMPANY.		Case No. 1518.

This case being at issue upon complaint and answer on file and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that the withdrawal of the sale of round-trip tickets by conductors on trains, as proposed by passenger tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 64 of the respondent company filed with this Commission May 4th, 1918, to become effective June 4th, 1918, is, in so far as concerns the withdrawal of the sale of such round-trip tickets by conductors to persons boarding trains at non-agency points going to Annapolis or Baltimore, Maryland, unjust, unreasonable and unduly discriminatory,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 21st day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That The Maryland Electric Railways Company be and it is hereby directed and required to continue in effect until the further order of this Commission in the premises the sale of round-trip tickets by conductors to persons boarding trains at non-agency points, or at stations where no ticket agent is on duty at the time, going to Annapolis or Baltimore, Maryland.

2. That said The Maryland Electric Railways Company be and it is hereby directed and required to file with this Commission on or before June 1st, 1918, its passenger tariff to become effective June 4th, 1918, canceling passenger tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 64 heretofore filed with the Commission to become effective on said date, and providing for the sale of round-trip tickets by conductors under the conditions aforesaid.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a certified copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission in writing within five days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4317.

In the Matter of The Complaint of GUY M. BOLLER, ET AL., vs. AMERICAN EXPRESS COMPANY.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1517.
---	---	---

This case being at issue upon complaint and answer on file and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that the discontinuance of the express agency heretofore maintained by the respondent at Loy's, Maryland, is unjust and unreasonable, and that in order that the respondent shall furnish adequate service it is necessary and proper that said respondent maintain an express agency at Loy's, Maryland,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 22nd day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the American Express Company be and it is hereby directed and required to restore on or before June 1st, 1918, the express agency formerly maintained by it at Loy's, Maryland, and to thereafter maintain same until the further order of this Commission in the premises.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a certified copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission in writing within five days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey same.

ORDER No. 4318.

In the Matter of The Application of NORTHERN VIRGINIA POWER COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$500,000 Par Value of Its Betterment Bonds, Proceeds from the Sale of Said Bonds to Be Used for the Liquidation of Lawful Outstanding Obligations and for the Betterment and Improvement of Said Company's Property and Fa- cilities.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1509.
--	---	---

WHEREAS, The Northern Virginia Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Virginia, has applied to this

Commission for authority to issue and sell its 20-Year Six Per Cent. Betterment Bonds of the aggregate principal amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000), being part of a total authorized issue of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) to be secured by a mortgage or deed of trust of all of the real and personal property now owned by the said Northern Virginia Power Company or hereafter acquired by it, the proceeds from the sale of said bonds to be used for the purpose of refunding or discharging said company's obligations incurred in making betterments, improvements and additions to its plant, including additions now under contract and in course of construction, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on April 30th, 1918, after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4272 passed April 17th, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after hearing that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue and sale of said bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of the said corporation, to wit: the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its plant and distributing system,

· IT IS, THEREFORE, This 24th day of May, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, 1. That the issue and sale for cash at par by the Northern Virginia Power Company of its 20-Year Six Per Cent. Betterment Bonds to the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the purposes in said application set forth be and the same is hereby authorized and approved.

2. That the said Northern Virginia Power Company shall make reports duly verified by affidavits, to this Commission as follows:

(a) Upon the issue and sale of its bonds, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such sale or sales, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this Order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said bonds and the facts and circumstances as to the property acquired and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its facilities.

ORDER No. 4822.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Recommendation of the UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION, by P. B. Noyes, Its Director of Conservation, Etc.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1506.</p>
--	---	---

The petition of T. Milton Ohler and one hundred and twenty-seven others in the above matter having been duly investigated, and the United Railways and Electric Company having orally waived its right to a hearing, it is this 24th day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore forthwith restore the northbound stop at Oakley Avenue and Park Heights Avenue during the school season;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper representatives of said United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that it notify this Commission within five (5) days after the receipt of said copy whether or not it will accept and abide by this order.

OPINION.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of the MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF SALISBURY</p> <p><i>vs.</i></p> <p>SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1174.</p>
---	---	---

TIMANUS, Commissioner.

Filed May 27th, 1918.

The original complaint in this case was directed solely against that clause in the respondent's schedule of rates, effective as of July 1st, 1916, which abolished the previous minimum rate of twelve dollars (\$12.00) a year for electric service and substituted a new minimum rate of one dollar per month. Subsequently a second petition was filed in the proceedings by the Mayor and City Council of Salisbury reciting that an examination of the annual reports of the Company showed

book values in excess of the actual value of its property, and alleging that if a valuation of the property were made it would be found that the returns were in excess of a reasonable return upon the investment. Upon the strength of these statements the complainants asked the Commission to direct a valuation of the property of the Company, such valuation to be conducted under the direction of the Assistant General Counsel to the Commission. This valuation was accordingly directed, and upon its completion the whole case came before the Commission for hearing. The hearings were held June 27th and 28th. A large amount of testimony was taken and numerous exhibits were filed.

Meanwhile the Company had filed a new schedule, No. 8, to become effective July 6th, 1917, making a general increase of 10 per cent. in its metered lighting rates, commercial flat rates, power rates, temporary service and cooking rates, this schedule providing that minimum bills should also be subject to said additional 10 per cent. By the new schedule the rates to yearly power consumers were raised by increases of from one-fourth cent to one cent per k. w. h. Subsequently other schedules were filed to become effective October 22nd, 1917, still further increasing the Company's rates to its consumers. A statement of the rates as they now stand will be found in a subsequent portion of this opinion.

As the amended petition of the complainants goes to the reasonableness of the respondent's schedules as a whole, the first inquiry is whether or not these schedules are designed to yield the owners of the utility a return in excess of a fair return upon the value of their investment in the public service. This inquiry being determined, we will be able properly to pass to a consideration of the reasonableness of the particular rates embraced in the schedules as they now stand, and whether or not the minimum charge complained of should be adjusted on a monthly or an annual basis. Incidentally, during the course of the proceedings, the point was raised that the Company's consumers in Salisbury were required to pay in the rates operating losses which the complainants alleged the Company was sustaining through its service to the suburbs of Salisbury and other points more remote. This contention involves apportionments of the Company's property, revenues and operating expenses. All these points will be considered in due order, after we have first considered the main point, the reasonableness of the return which may fairly be anticipated under the schedules as a whole.

The Fair Worth of the Service.

- The general rule in all cases involving the reasonableness of rates to be charged by a public service enterprise is that the proprietors of the enterprise are entitled to demand and the public should be required to pay such charges for the service as are just and fair under all the circumstances of the particular case. The most the proprietors of the enterprise may expect to be permitted to charge is the full cost of that

service, including in such cost a reasonable return upon the fair value of the property used in the service; and the most the public should be required to pay under any circumstances is what the service is fairly worth, even though the fair worth of the service may be less than its actual cost, accounted as above stated.

Ordinarily the actual cost of rendering a given service to the public is the best evidence of the worth of that service to the public, just as the actual cost of producing and marketing any other commodity ordinarily determines the value or cost of that commodity in the open market. In ascertaining the cost of rendering a public service of any kind, account must be taken of all ordinary expenses of operation, such as fuel, labor, repairs, etc., and also of the cost of replacing any of the property of the owners which is used up in the public service. For instance, the cost of the boiler which is gradually consumed or worn out in the public service is just as much a cost of operation as is the cost of the coal which is used in feeding that boiler and producing the commodity of the utility, whether it be light, heat, power, water or any other public service. But in addition to these costs of operation, which are items shown by the books or vouchers of the utility, the owners of the property are entitled to a reasonable return upon the fair value of their property used in the public service. Persons engaged in all other lines of business expect a return upon the value of their property used in such business—otherwise they would not put their money into such lines of business. And so with the owners of public utility properties. Unless they can have some reasonable assurance of being permitted to earn a reasonable return upon the fair value of their property used in the public service, they will not go into the public service, but will go into some other line of business where they may have reasonable grounds to believe they will receive such return. Hence it is that in all rate-making cases a fair return upon the value of the property used in the service is ordinarily added to the operating and maintenance expenses above referred to and the sum of them all taken as the cost of rendering the given public service.

This cost is accepted as the fair worth of the service to the consumer, because of the presumption that a service of any kind is ordinarily worth at least its cost, and that the consumer, individually or considered as a group, could not render himself the same service at a less cost.

Of course these presumptions are based upon the assumption of proper and reasonably economical business management, since the public could not reasonably be expected to make up the losses occasioned by unbusiness-like or careless management, or by wastefulness in connection with the many phases of operation. Again, before the cost of service may safely be considered as the final measure of the worth of such service, it must appear that ordinarily good business prudence and judgment have been exercised both as to the choice of location for the enterprise and as to the amount and character of capital expenditures made in connection with establishing the same.

For the public, which is made in a large degree dependent for service upon an enterprise which enters the field and undertakes to render such service at reasonable rates, cannot be expected to reimburse the proprietors or owners of such enterprise for losses occasioned by bad business judgment in entering the field at all in the first place, or for subsequent bad business judgment in establishing a plant not adapted to render such service as economically as reasonably possible.

But starting with the assumptions that good business judgment has been exercised by the proprietors of the enterprise both in entering the field and in making their capital expenditures in the first instance, and with the further assumption of reasonably good business management in connection with the operation of the enterprise, all of which presumptions are rebuttable, it can ordinarily be conceded that a schedule of charges as a whole should be such as to yield a return of all operating expenses, including reasonable allowances on account of depreciation, plus a fair return upon the value of the investment.

But even where a schedule as a whole is found to yield no more than a fair net return upon the investment, it by no means follows that all or even any of the individual rates contained in the schedule are themselves reasonable. General classifications may of themselves be unreasonable or arbitrary, and particular rates may be discriminatory as to individuals or classes of consumers. Or it may well be, as is not infrequently the case, that the individual rates which would have to be charged in order to yield a given percentage of return upon the fair value of the property would be higher than the actual worth of the service to the consumer judged by some extrinsic standard entirely independent of the actual cost of rendering the service as a whole. For illustration, this Commission in several instances has found cases where the actual cost of rendering a given service to the individual was so great, when compared with the degree of accommodation afforded him, or when compared with rates charged for the same commodity by other utilities operating under similar conditions, that we have been obliged to declare such charges unreasonable in themselves, and thereby hold that the actual cost of rendering the service was not the only or final test of the fair worth thereof. But with these occasional exceptions, this Commission has usually adhered to the general rule above stated, that the fair worth of a service is what it costs to produce that service, and, in computing that cost, has included a reasonable return upon the fair value of the investment used for the public benefit. To hold otherwise in the ordinary case would not only result in injustice to those who have heretofore invested their money in the service of the public in this State, but would also inevitably result in deterring others from hereafter investing in such enterprises, and in making it impossible for our present public service corporations to make those extensions to their plants and service which the public is so constantly and insistently demanding.

The Valuation.

It follows from what we have just stated that the first step in a rate-making case is to ascertain the fair value of the property used in the public service.

In this case there was but one valuation of the property in question, and that valuation was made by the Commission's Engineering Department as of January 1, 1917. The plan followed by the Chief Engineer in making this valuation was that commonly known as the "reproduction-cost-new-less-depreciation" plan of valuation, which means simply that he based his estimates of the value of the property upon what it would cost to reproduce the same new as of January 1, 1917, and deducted from this sum an amount estimated by him to represent the depreciation which the property had actually undergone since the dates of the original installation of its component parts. The unit costs used by the Engineering Department of the Commission in making this valuation were not those relatively high costs which obtained on the first day of January, 1917, but were a fair average of the costs which had obtained for some four or five years prior to that date.

The final valuation made by the Engineering Department of the entire property of the Company as of January 1, 1917, was as follows:

	<i>Reproduction</i>		<i>Present</i>
	<i>Cost New</i>	<i>Depreciation</i>	<i>Value</i>
Salisbury	\$185,289	\$22,238	\$163,051
Suburban	10,329	1,342	8,987
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$195,618	\$23,580	\$172,038
Delmar	6,799	884	5,915
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total.....	\$202,417	\$24,464	\$177,953

To this was to be added the Engineering Department's estimate of \$15,000 for working capital, the same being made up as follows:

Three months' pay-roll (1916).....	\$2,200
Material and supplies.....	9,000
Fuel stock.....	2,500
Cash	1,300
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$15,000

The report of the Auditor showed that the actual working capital of the Company on December 31, 1916, was \$7,738.11.

Working capital has been defined by this Commission as "the amount of cash and supplies, or other available assets readily convertible into cash without pecuniary sacrifice, reasonably necessary to be kept on hand by the Company for the purpose of meeting its current obliga-

tions as they arise, and enabling it to operate economically and efficiently * * * and, generally, should be a sum reasonably sufficient to bridge the gap between outlay and reimbursement."

It is obvious that "working capital" as so defined is as much an investment in the public service as is other capital which is actually invested in the plant and other physical property used in such service. Hence in every rate-making case it is customary to include such an allowance in the investment upon which a return is to be allowed.

The representatives of the respondent Company did not submit to the Commission an independent valuation, but expressed themselves as satisfied with the valuation of the Commission's Engineering Department except as to an alleged undervaluation of some \$8,000 in the case of the Company's water power, and the omission of allowances for promotion, the cost of money and going value, these latter being intangible values upon which the Engineering Department is not expected to place any valuation in making an appraisal of the physical property.

In the case of the water power the Commission decided at the hearing that the Chief Engineer's valuation of \$1,500 was entirely inadequate, and that the fair value of the same was at least \$7,500. (Record, p. 184.) This estimate of value was intended to embrace all overheads.

In the case of the alleged intangible values above referred to the Company claimed an allowance of 10 per cent. for promotion, brokerage and discount, and a further allowance of 17 per cent. for going value, both percentages being based upon the reproduction cost new value of the property less depreciation, an aggregate of approximately \$49,500, the amount carried on its books as intangible capital.

In all estimates of the cost of reproducing the property of a public utility it is customary to assume that there will be a greater or less expense attending its promotion and the flotation of the securities necessary to raise the capital requisite for construction purposes. These allowances usually run as high as 10 per cent. and frequently more. But while they are usually allowed, as stated, in estimating the technical reproduction cost of the property, it does not necessarily follow that they should be allowed in the final ascertainment of the fair value of the property for rate-making purposes, since in nearly every instance it is impossible to determine from the books of the Company whether or not these expenses have been recouped in whole or in part out of earnings over and above a fair return upon the investment. To allow them in many cases is to assume that they have not been so recouped out of excess earnings, while to disallow them is to assume that they have been so recouped. In the case now before us, the evidence of the books of the Company, while not wholly satisfying as to exactly what profits have been earned in the past, seems to be clear to the effect that such expenditures, whatever they were in fact, were paid or remain still to be paid at the expense of reasonable dividends to the stockholders, and it would therefore seem that some allowance

should be made upon this account, but not the 10 per cent. claimed by the Company. Under all the circumstances of this case we conclude that 5 per cent. would be a reasonable allowance on this account as between the owners and the public.

In the case of going value, sometimes referred to as development cost or cost of establishing the business, the law is clear that whenever the fair value of the property of a public utility for rate-making purposes is to be ascertained, some allowance must be made the owners on account of the fact that their business is an established one to a greater or less extent, and that such fact gives to the property an inherent added value which cannot fairly be disregarded. Just what allowance should be made on this account is a matter ordinarily left to the sound judgment and discretion of the rate-making tribunal, a discretion which should be exercised in the light of all the attendant facts of each particular case. Our Auditor's report, Commission's Exhibit No. 6, File No. 65, shows that on December 31, 1916, this Company had on its books the names of 1,207 consumers, made up of 386 stores, 761 residences and 60 commercial power users, in addition to which it had a considerable installation of municipal street lighting service, the aggregate net receipts from current being \$41,257 for the year ending on that date. To attach this business certainly cost money, and while that cost has been paid as an operating expense, the books clearly show that the great bulk of the business has been attached at the expense of the stockholders and not at the expense of the public. It is true that the actual value of the business so attached depends largely upon the rates which the Company may be permitted to charge and which the consumers may be willing to pay. But it is also true that the intrinsic worth of the property to the stockholders, reasonable rates assumed, is materially greater with this business attached than it would be without it. Under all the circumstances of this case and in the light of the facts before us, we conclude that an allowance of 10 per cent. upon the reproduction cost of the property less depreciation is a reasonable one for its going value as above defined.

Summarizing the foregoing conclusions, we find the reproduction-cost-new-depreciated value of the property to be as follows:

Chief Engineer's estimate.....	\$177,953
Excess value of water-power.....	6,000
	<hr/>
	\$183,953
Promotion and cost of money, 5%.....	9,198
Going value, 10%.....	18,395
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$211,546

To this should be added \$10,000 for working capital, which we consider a reasonable allowance in the light of the evidence before us. This brings the aggregate investment up to \$221,546.

The above figures embody proper deductions on account of the depreciation which the property as a whole has undergone to the date of the valuation. This estimate of existing depreciation has been based upon the Chief Engineer's estimates of the actual age in service of the various component parts of the plant and property, the difference between such actual age in service and the estimated total life in service of each element representing the number of years such element may reasonably be expected to continue in service. The Chief Engineer's estimates of the present value of the property are based upon the latter supposition, this being known as theoretical depreciation, to distinguish it from estimates of depreciation based upon actual physical inspection. The justification for adopting theory instead of actual physical inspection in computing existing or accrued depreciation lies largely in the fact that the same figures can be used both for computing the accrued depreciation and also for computing the allowances which should be made the owner from year to year to guarantee the ultimate replacement of all parts of the physical plant when and as they go out of service. In addition this method of computing depreciation takes into account many forms of depreciation which the inspection method does not disclose, and would seem to be fair both to the owner and to the public. For these reasons it is the method usually adopted by this Commission in all its valuation work where a large number of separate elements are embraced in the plant and property under consideration.

The foregoing figure, \$221,546, represents this Commission's estimate of the cost of reproducing the particular property here in question as of January 1, 1917, with proper allowances for depreciation to that date.

The cost of reproduction does not necessarily and in all cases represent the true fair value of property for rate-making purposes. Nevertheless, it is strong evidence of such value, since it takes into account not only the actual cost of the property to the investor, but also any appreciation which may have taken place in the value of the property since it was originally installed. And in a rate-making case, particularly in one where the element of confiscation may be involved, it is the value of the property at the time of the inquiry which must be mainly considered, rather than its value at some remote time in the past when it was originally purchased.

But inasmuch as the chief aim in every rate-making case is to reach a result which will be fair both to the owner and to the public under all the circumstances of each particular case, it not infrequently happens that there are other evidences of value which must also be given due consideration. Conditions arising out of the present war furnish an excellent illustration of the weight which actual cost should be given in a rate-making case, and how unsafe and, in many instances, unjust, it would be to adhere strictly to the reproduction cost theory of reproduction in every rate-making case, regardless of circumstances or of the conditions under which the property was actually installed.

Thus, were this Commission, at the date of the writing of this opinion, to adopt and adhere strictly to the literal reproduction cost method of ascertaining the fair present value of the property here in question, we would find that the enhanced costs of material and labor due entirely to war conditions would materially increase the cost of reproducing said property over its reproduction cost as estimated by our Engineering Department. And yet we know that the property as such has no more intrinsic value today than it had two or three years ago, if as much, since the very conditions which add to its theoretical reproduction cost make it correspondingly more expensive to operate and therefore of less real value to its owners. And we know, moreover, that when the war is over and prices of material and labor have returned to normal pre-war conditions, a valuation made upon the basis of war prices and war conditions generally would be wholly misleading and would result in confusion both to the public and to the owners of the property in question as well as to those who might have purchased its stocks, bonds or other securities upon the supposition that the property was actually worth the inflated value placed upon it by the use of war prices in determining its reproduction cost.

On the other hand, common fairness to the owners of the property would seem to require that where property now in place has actually been installed during the period of the war and at prices greatly in excess of the normal prices current prior to the war, such owners should be permitted to earn a return upon the actual cost of the property installed under such conditions, and that such return should be permitted to continue until the property so purchased has gradually been retired from service.

The same argument would seem to justify the adoption of original cost or actual investment, as it is sometimes termed, as the basis of arriving at fair value in all rate-making cases. And if it were possible in all cases to arrive at the exact original cost or actual cash investment, and then to make the proper adjustments for both appreciation and depreciation, as the same might be found to exist in the case of each individual element embraced in the general plant and property, this method would unquestionably be used to a greater extent than it now is.

But the great difficulty in the use of original cost or actual investment as the controlling basis in determining fair value for rate-making purposes lies in determining what such original cost actually was. Before the day of rate regulation by commission there was no single authoritative system of accounts by which the books of public utilities were kept or supervised, nor were there any commonly accepted definitions of such accounting terms as "operating expenses," "maintenance," "current repairs," "replacements," "depreciation," "earnings," etc., with the result that in many instances replacements or other capital investments were made out of earnings, and other entries made which were no doubt entirely satisfactory to the owners of the property, but are entirely misleading when the effort is now made to use

the values carried on the books as the original cost of the property or as representing the true actual cash investment of the stockholders.

For instance, in the case now before us, while our Engineering Department advises us that the reproduction cost new of the physical property as of January 1, 1917, is \$202,417, and the accrued or existing depreciation \$24,464, leaving a present worth of \$177,953, the books on the same date showed an investment of only \$142,648 with a depreciation reserve of but \$1,388. To recast these books in the light of accounting rules and definitions adopted in more recent years by this Commission would be an almost interminable task, and if, when that were done, we should then add the appreciation in value which has unquestionably taken place in some of the property since the date of its purchase and installation, the strong probabilities are that our final figure would not be far different from that submitted by our Engineering Department as the reproduction cost of the property as of January 1, 1917.

For these reasons we are inclined to accept our final figure of \$221,546 as the fair value of the property here in question as of January 1, 1917, with the understanding that property installed since that date under war conditions and at war prices is to be added at its actual cost less depreciation in determining the fair value of the property in connection with the making of rates to be effective in future.

But before accepting the above figure as the fair value of the property it is necessary for us, under the authorities, to consider the earning capacity of the property under the existing rates, the amount and market value of the Company's stocks, bonds or other securities, and any other circumstances which may bear upon the fair value of the property as between its owners and the general public.

Considering these propositions as one, we find no peculiar circumstances in this case which would justify our modifying the above determination as to the fair value of this property.

The Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company was incorporated November 27, 1901, under the General Incorporation Laws of Maryland with an authorized capital stock of \$100,000, par value, \$100 per share. This Company operated independently for some years in Salisbury and its suburbs. The original \$100,000 of capital stock was duly issued, and on December 1, 1901, the Company created a bonded indebtedness of \$75,000, of which \$26,500 was retired prior to January 1, 1917, through a sinking fund created for the purpose. The Company's annual reports to the Commission showed earnings for the years ending June 30, 1911, to June 30, 1915, on the basis of book values, without any deductions for appropriations to depreciation reserves, approximately as follows:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Book Values</i>	<i>Per Cent. Return</i>
1911.....	\$177,770	4.9%
1912.....	195,139	6.4%
1913.....	197,982	3.4%
1914.....	192,441	4.04%
1915.....	193,644	6.7%

On May 20, 1915, the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company, a Delaware corporation, was authorized by Order No. 2344 of this Commission to purchase all the capital stock of the Salisbury Company at \$210 per share, an aggregate of \$210,000, there being at that time bonds outstanding to the amount of \$48,500. The balance sheet of the Salisbury Company as of November 30, 1914, filed with the application for the above Order (Case No. 944, File No. 1) showed total assets of \$195,092.96, including the item of \$49,500 covering Franchises, Licenses and Contracts above referred to. The purchaser paid for the stock \$110,000 in cash and two-year notes and the remaining \$100,000 in common and preferred stock of the Eastern Shore Company.

On May 3, 1916, this Commission, upon the joint application of the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company and the Salisbury Company, passed its Order No. 2831 authorizing these two companies to enter into an agreement as of October 1, 1915, whereby the former Company should operate the property of the latter in return for a commission of 2 per cent. of the gross earnings of the Salisbury plant over and above all the expenses of operation. On the same day this Commission, by its Order No. 2832, authorized the Salisbury Company to purchase from the Eastern Shore Company the plant and property of the latter in Delmar, Maryland, the Eastern Shore Company continuing to operate on its own account the property in Delmar, Delaware.

The testimony in Case No. 944 disclosed that the Salisbury Company had not at that time paid any dividends for more than five years past, all its earnings in excess of operating expenses having gone into additions, betterments and improvements. This testimony also disclosed the fact that the bonds and stock of the Company had never been sold on the open market to the knowledge of the witnesses. The evidence in the present case was to the same effect, although the witnesses for the Company asserted that the market value of the stock should be considered \$210 per share, that being the price paid for it by the Eastern Shore Company in the transaction above referred to, and that the bonds were worth par. This Commission is not prepared to concede that the price paid for the stock under such circumstances should be accepted as creating any such equities in its present holders as to justify an increase in the fair value of the property for rate-making purposes over and above the cost of reproducing the same at the date of the inquiry, especially in view of the fact that the balance sheet of the Company at the date of such transaction showed total assets of all kinds considerably less than the price so paid for such stock, independently of the outstanding bonds, the payment of which was virtually assumed by the purchasers of the stock.

Nor do we find anything in the history of the Company as to its earnings which in our judgment would justify us in attributing to the property any additional value by reason of its earning capacity. The history of the Company in question is much the same in a general way as is the history of many other similar companies which are subject to our jurisdiction. The Company, prior to the period of regulation by

this Commission, which began in 1910, adopted such rates as it felt the business would bear, and has never since had its rates reduced by any order of this Commission. Under such rates, adopted by the Company of its own volition, it has never been able to earn what this Commission would have considered a reasonable return had the question been presented to it, and even the nominal earnings shown by the books of the Company are subject to decrease on account of the expense of accruing depreciation which should have been charged against earnings, but was not.

For the above reasons this Commission concludes that the fair value of the property of the Company as of January 1, 1917, was \$221,546.

THE RATES

The first schedule of the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company was filed with this Commission December 9, 1910, and provided flat rates for lighting as follows:

Residence

First 64 candle-power.....	\$1.75 per month
Each additional candle-power.....	.015 " "

Commercial

Each 16 c. p. lamp.....	\$.50 per month
" 24 " "75 " "
" 32 " "	1.00 " "
" 50 " "	1.50 " "

These rates were subject to a discount of ten per cent. for prompt payment. In addition to the flat rates, the schedule provided a meter rate of ten cents (net) per k. w. h. subject to a monthly minimum of \$1.50. However, it would appear that the great majority of services were at the time on the flat rate basis, there being but 122 meters in use on June 30th, 1910, as against 712 on June 30th, 1915.

The next schedule was filed June 30th, 1911, and published the same rates with the exception that it was silent respecting the minimum charge. A letter accompanying the schedule stated that the entire system was being metered, and that the work would probably be completed in the course of several months, but that at the time the Company could give no indication as to what the metered rates would be.

On December 13th, 1912, the Company filed a metered rate schedule (lighting and power) with no provision for flat rates, and this schedule can properly be considered as the first metered rate schedule. It provided a meter rate of ten cents per k. w. h. with a minimum charge of twelve dollars per year per meter.

The next schedule of the Company (P. S. C. Md. No. 6) was filed effective June 1, 1916, and provided rates as follows: First 50 k. w. h. at 10 cents, next 50 k. w. h. at 9 cents, next 50 k. w. h. at 8 cents, next 50 k. w. h. at 7 cents, next 50 k. w. h. at 6 cents, excess over 250 k. w. h. at 6 cents, with a minimum of one dollar per month per meter.

Subsequently the Company filed a new schedule (P. S. C. Md. No. 7) effective July 5, 1916, adding one cent per k. w. h. to the rates named in P. S. C. Md. No. 6 and allowing a discount of ten per cent. for payment within twenty days of reading of meter.

Meanwhile other changes had been made in the power schedules of the Company, such changes being shown at length in Report No. 42 of the Commission's Rate Clerk, File No. 11 in these proceedings.

On September 9, 1916, the Company further amended its existing schedule of power rates by providing for the waiver of part of the minimum charge where power consumers were completely shut down for a period exceeding thirty consecutive days, a ninety per cent. reduction being made in the guaranteed minimum in such cases during the period of the shut-down, provided that in no case should the payment in any month be less than one dollar.

On November 20th, 1916, the Company established a cooking rate of four cents per k. w. h. subject to a minimum charge of two dollars per month.

July 6th, 1917, the Company put in effect a new schedule (P. S. C. Md. No. 8) adding ten per cent. to the gross bills under the existing rates, including minimum bills, in the case of metered lighting rates, commercial flat rates, power rates, temporary service and cooking rates. Such schedule also established power rates for customers who failed to contract for service for one year or longer, said rates being from one-fourth cent to one cent per k. w. h. in excess of the rates provided for yearly power consumers.

By a supplement filed to become effective October 8th, 1917, the rate to power consumers having contracts for one year or longer for consumption between 4,000 k. w. h. and 6,000 k. w. h. was increased from two to two and one-half cents per k. w. h., and for consumption from 6,000 k. w. h. to 12,000 k. w. h. from one and three-quarter cents to two cents per k. w. h., the charge for consumption in excess of 12,000 k. w. h. per month remaining the same, one and three-quarter cents per k. w. h. A supplement filed to take effect October 22, 1917, eliminated a discount of fifteen per cent. theretofore allowed if bill for power consumption were paid within ten days after being presented, and also eliminated the existing ten per cent. discount in the case of the metered lighting rate schedule.

The Commission's Rate Clerk has prepared for us the following condensed statement of the lighting and power rates of the Company existing at the date of this opinion:

"Lighting Rates

"First 50 k. w. h. hours per month.....	11c. per k. w. h.
Next 50 " " " "	10c. " "
" 50 " " " "	9c. " "
" 50 " " " "	8c. " "
Over 200 " " " "	7c. " "

Minimum charge of \$1.00 per month.

"Power Rates

"First	200 k. w. h. per month.....	7c. per k. w. h.
Next	800 " " "	6c. " "
"	500 " " "	5c. " "
"	1,000 " " "	4c. " "
"	2,000 " " "	3c. " "
"	2,000 " " "	2½c. " "
"	6,000 " " "	2c. " "
Over 12,000	" " "	1½c. " "

"Minimum \$1.00 per horsepower per month for first 4 h. p., 40c. per h. p. per month for next 15 h. p., and 50c. per h. p. per month where the connected load is over 19 h. p. When plant of power user is shut down for a period exceeding 30 consecutive days, and service disconnected, a 90 per cent. reduction in minimum charge will be made, the minimum payment in any month to be \$1.00.

"To the net amount of bill for current for either power or lighting use (including minimum charge) an amount equal to 10 per cent. of the bill is added.

"In addition the schedules provide special rates for sign, outline display and window lighting purposes, breakdown service, temporary service and cooking service, but it is not
 special schedules, as
 an extent."

as have been increased
 statement, and further
 showing how very far
 charged by the Com-
 to attempt an accurate

prognostication as to the revenues which may reasonably be anticipated to be yielded by the existing rates.

Starting with the year ended June 30, 1916, during which the old rates were in force, and assuming the average value of the investment for that year to have been \$215,830, this sum being arrived at by making the proper deductions for additions from our estimate of \$221,546 as the fair value of the property January 1, 1917, we find that the earnings of the Company for the year, as shown by its books, were \$11,719. These apparent earnings did not, however, take into account any allowance for the creation or maintenance of a depreciation reserve. The reports of the Commission's Chief Engineer filed in these proceedings show that approximately three and three-quarters per cent. of the fair value of the entire property would be a reasonable allowance on this account. Applying this percentage to the fair value of the property as ascertained by us, less working capital, we get, \$7,719 as the proper depreciation allowance for that year. Deducting

such \$7,719 from the \$11,719 nominal earnings shown by the books, this would leave actual earnings of \$4,000 during this year, or a return of 1.85 per cent. upon the average fair value of the investment.

The average fair value of the property for the year ending December 30, 1916, was \$217,700. The earnings shown by the books during this period were \$14,128, which sum is subject to the deduction of \$7,789, leaving true earnings of approximately \$6,439, or a return of 2.95 per cent. upon the average fair value of the investment during the year.

During the year ended June 30, 1917, the average fair value of the property was \$224,179, and the nominal earnings shown by the books \$11,926. Deducting \$7,932 for a depreciation allowance, leaves \$3,994 real earnings, or a return of 1.78 per cent. upon the average fair value of the investment.

It is obvious that with such showings as the above, it could not well be contended that the Company's earnings under its existing schedules, taken as a whole, are excessive or unreasonable.

Nor do we find that any particular rates in either the light or power schedules of the Company are unreasonable in themselves or in any way discriminatory as between any classes of consumers. The initial lighting rate of eleven cents per k. w. h. for the first 50 k. w. h. per month and power rate of seven cents for the first 200 k. w. h. per month are not unreasonable or excessive when viewed in the light of rates charged by other companies in this State somewhat similarly situated, and the remaining rates in each schedule are stepped down with increases of consumption in the manner usually adopted by companies of this kind.

The Monthly Minimum Charge

As we stated in an early portion of this opinion, the main objection made by the Mayor and City Council of Salisbury to the published rates of the Company was the objection to the change of the former annual minimum rate of twelve dollars to the new monthly minimum rate of one dollar, now one dollar and ten cents. The principal point made in this connection was the statement of the Mayor of Salisbury at the hearing that the smaller patrons of the Company in many instances were required to pay under this plan for current which they did not actually use and failed to get credit for such alleged excess payments by an adjustment of the same over the entire year, it appearing from the testimony of the Mayor that the local gas and water companies respectively permitted such annual adjustment. In view of this latter fact and of the further fact that the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company formerly permitted an adjustment on the annual basis, it is not surprising that objection should be made by these smaller consumers to the innovation put into effect by the latter Company, an objection which we have frequently known to be made in other communities where the monthly adjustment is in effect.

At the suggestion of the Assistant General Counsel, the Commission's Rate Clerk filed in these proceedings his Report No. 102 (File No. 50) designed to show the practice of electric light and power companies subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission with respect to the charging of minimum rates on a monthly or annual basis. This report showed there were 69 such companies, 17 of which had no minimum charges specified in their schedules, 9 of which made adjustments on the annual basis, and 43 of which made adjustments on the monthly basis.

In a number of instances in the past this Commission has approved the plan of monthly or quarterly adjustments of minimum charges in the case of public service corporations subject to its jurisdiction, and with but one exception, that of the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore City, has it ever held that the annual basis was equitable or just to the Company where such question was in dispute. In that case the circumstances were wholly different from those which exist in the case of the smaller companies throughout the State, and the Commission concluded that the annual adjustment was proper under such circumstances.

The principle of the "readiness to serve" charge in the case of all public utilities, particularly in the case of those which have contracts for service with their patrons, has long been recognized as a sound principle of rate-making, and whether this principle shall be applied upon a monthly, quarterly or annual basis of adjustment is a question which must be decided by the character and nature of the service involved.

In this case the report of the Commission's Auditor (File No. 65) showed the following interesting facts for the six months ended December 30, 1916:

Commercial Lighting—Stores

Number of consumers.....	386	
Number charged minimum.....	104	
Amount of minimum charges.....		\$374.00
K. W. H. actually consumed.....	1,582	
Amount at minimum rates.....		174.02
		<hr/>
Difference between above.....		\$199.98

Commercial Lighting—Houses

Number of consumers.....	761	
Number charged minimum.....	336	
Amount of minimum charges.....		\$832.50
K. W. H. actually consumed.....	5,021	
Amount at minimum rates.....		552.31
		<hr/>
Difference between above.....		\$280.19

The above figures show that there was a comparatively large number of the Company's patrons who at some time during each year consumed less current than was paid for by the monthly minimum rate. And these, we understand, are the patrons who complain of the monthly adjustment.

But these patrons should remember that whether they actually use the current or not it is there for them to use, and that in order to have it there for them to use the Company must maintain a large generating plant and extensive distribution lines, all of which mean expense which must be met by the public.

At the hearing representatives of the Company presented figures tending to show the aggregate of such costs during the year ended December 31, 1916, these figures being filed with the Commission in the form of a series of exhibits, (File No. 68).

Exhibit C of this series shows that during the year ended June 30, 1916, there were 422 customers who did not consume 10 k. w. h. during one or more months of the year (this being the allowance of current under the minimum rate of \$1.00 per month, i. e., 10 k. w. h. at 10c. per k. w. h., \$1.00), and that these 422 customers consumed an average of 6.10 k. w. h. each per month. During the year there were generated 549,550 k. w. h. of current at a total production cost of \$12,595, making an average cost of .0229c. per k. w. h. or an average of 14c. per month for each of the above 422 customers. This, we understand, represents the bare cost of generating the current actually consumed by these customers. In addition there are costs attending the reading of meters, accounting, collections, etc., classified as commercial expenses, all of which are fairly apportionable among the customers of the Company, and aggregating .078c. per month per customer. Then there are certain distribution expenses, i. e., superintendence, office expenses, repairs to distribution lines, etc., which according to the Company's figures prorate .201 per month per customer. In addition there are certain general expenses, i. e., salaries and expenses of general officers and clerks, printing and stationery, insurance, management, etc., which the Company has apportioned upon the basis of $\frac{1}{6}$ by number of customers and $\frac{1}{6}$ by kilowatt hours, each class, and aggregating 49c. per month per customer.

In addition to the above strictly operating expenses, the benefit of which is received by all who use any current at all, there are additional expenses which go on regardless of the amount of current consumed, but which are incident to the mere "readiness to serve" of which each customer gets the benefit whether he uses any current or not. These consist of interest on the investment and an allowance for depreciation. The Company's figures for these, based upon the aggregate of 10 per cent. for the two, is 81c. per customer per month.

Summarizing these, we get the following:

<i>Operation</i>	
Production	\$.14
Commercial078
Distribution201
New business141
General49
<hr/>	
Total	\$1.05
Fixed charges (interest and depreciation)....	.81
<hr/>	
Total	\$1.86

While this Commission does not accept finally either the Company's apportionments of all the above costs among the smaller consumers, or concede that a minimum monthly charge must at all events equal or even nearly approach the actual cost of rendering the service during months when the minimum service is rendered, the above figures are at least illustrative of the nature and extent of the service which is actually being received month in and month out by these smaller consumers, and demonstrate how unreasonable is the contention that a company of this kind must stand ready at all times to render the small consumer any quantity of service he may desire, and yet receive nothing in return for that readiness to serve unless such consumer desires to avail himself of the same.

But that is not the only aspect of the case. There is no contention here that any of the other classes of service are being rendered at so much below actual cost as to result in discrimination against the residence and store lighting customers, or that such discrimination exists as between these two classes. Under such circumstances, if the monthly minimum rate were to be abolished and the annual yearly rate substituted in its place, the consequent loss in revenue to the Company would have to be made up by an increase in the rate per k. w. h. charged the residence customers as a class or the store customers as a class, as the case might be. The result of this would be to increase the cost of the service to those residence or store customers who ordinarily use more than the 10 k. w. h. allowed under the minimum rate, and reduce it to those who use less. This, in our judgment, would result, under the circumstances of this particular case, in grossly unfair discrimination against the former class in favor of the latter, and we can see no good reason, under the facts in this case, why those consumers who desire the facilities of electric light service in their houses or stores, as the case may be, should be permitted to enjoy such convenience and have the cost thereof paid by those who are already paying more nearly the fair cost of the service which they are receiving.

For these reasons the minimum monthly rates prescribed by the schedules now in force will not be disturbed.

The only remaining question in the case is that relating to the cost of the Delmar service.

The revised report of the Chief Engineer of the Commission (File No. 70) shows the reproduction cost new of the Delmar plant, consisting of poles and fixtures, overhead conductors, services, meters, line transformers and the street lighting system, to be \$6,799 and the depreciation \$884, leaving a depreciated value of \$5,915 as of January 1, 1917.

The evidence of Mr. Dunn, Auditor of the Commission (Record p. 137, File No. 58) shows that the current supplied in the Maryland part of Delmar is furnished by the Eastern Shore Gas and Electric Company from its Laurel plant and billed to the Salisbury Company at 2½c. per k. w. h. plus 25 per cent. to cover transmission and distribution line losses. The Auditor's report (File No. 65) shows that the gross receipts of the Salisbury Company from its Delmar patrons were \$1,946.32 from May 1, 1916, the date the Delmar property was taken over, to December 31, 1916, a period of eight months. The cost of this current to the Salisbury Company was \$475.20, leaving a gross profit of \$1,471.12.

Taking the figures as to cost of current from the Company's Exhibit C (File No. 68), with other figures from the report of our Auditor, we find the following costs of this service:

Commercial expenses per customer per month.	\$.078
New business, same.....	.141
General expense, same.....	.49
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$.709
Number of customers.....	141
Number of months.....	8
	<hr/>
Customer months.....	1,128
	<hr/>
Aggregate cost, per above.....	\$799.75
Depreciation @ 8% on \$5,915, value of plant, for 8 months.....	315.47
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$1,115.22
Receipts, net.....	1,471.12
	<hr/>
Net profit.....	\$355.90
Return on investment.....	6.02%

Thus we see that the Company's profits from its Delmar business are materially greater than those from its Salisbury business proper, and therefore the patrons of Salisbury could not well be heard to object to the inclusion of the Delmar business in our summary of the entire net earnings of the Company from the entire field which it serves.

For the reasons hereinbefore contained the complaint must be dismissed, and an order will be passed to such effect.

ORDER No. 4323.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of the MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF SALISBURY</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1174.</p>
--	---	---

For the reasons set forth in the foregoing Opinion it is this 27th day of May, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the petition of the complainants in the above entitled cause be and the same is hereby dismissed.

ORDER No. 4325.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BAL- TIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated April 22nd, 1918, Between It and the SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY for the Purchase by the Former and the Sale by the Latter of a Fifty Per Cent. Joint Ownership of Four Poles Located in Salisbury, District No. 9, Wicomico County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20th, 1916, in Case No. 1131.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1523.</p>
--	---	---

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-ninth day of May, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4331.

In the Matter of The Petition of THE BEL AIR WATER AND LIGHT COMPANY for Permission to File and Publish on Less Than Statu- tory Notice Petitioner's Rate Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 4.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 535.
--	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 6th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Bel Air Water and Light Company to file and publish on not less than twenty days' notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's rate schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 4, to become effective July 1st, 1918, the rates, charges, rules and regulations therein to be as shown in copy of said schedule filed herein.

PROVIDED, Said schedule be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and that notice be immediately given the Company's patrons of the change in rates, and that all copies of said schedule shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4331, of date June 6th, 1918."

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered,** That by passing this Order the Public Service Commission is not to be taken as in any sense whatever approving any rates, rules, regulations or charges that may be filed under the authority of this Order; all such rates, rules, regulations and charges being left as fully subject to investigation and correction on complaint, or on the Commission's own motion under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law as if this Order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4333.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Recommendation of the UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION by P.B. Noyes, Its Director of Conservation, Etc.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. ____.

The petition of Charles E. Rieman, trustee of the estate of Joseph H. Rieman, having been duly investigated, and the United Railways and Electric Company having orally waived its right to a hearing, it is this 5th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore forthwith restore the northbound stop at Brown's Gate "Stoneleigh" and the southbound stop at Rieman's gate on the York Road line of the respondent Company.

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper representatives of said United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that it notify this Commission within five days after the receipt of said copy whether or not it will accept and abide by this order.

ORDER No. 4336.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of the DENTON BUS COMPANY to Discontinue Its Motor Vehicle Service Between Denton and Hurlock, Maryland.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1529.

WHEREAS, The above entitled application having been received and filed, and the Transportation Expert of the Commission having been directed to investigate and file a report thereon, and having this day filed his report, and the Commission having duly considered said application and report and being of the opinion in view of the facts presented to it that the application should be granted,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This tenth day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of the Denton Bus Company to discontinue its service between Denton and Hurlock, Maryland, be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4338.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of the J. N. SCHWANDER SHOE COMPANY		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1468.
TERMINAL FREEZING AND HEATING COMPANY.		

The above entitled matter having been set for hearing on March 13th, 1918, by Order No. 4190, dated March 6th, 1918, and having been heard on the date set and both parties having been represented at the hearing, in person or by proxy, and the Commission having suggested certain terms for the settlement of the controversy, in which both parties acquiesced, and the record in the case showing that both parties have complied with the terms as outlined by the Commission and agreed to by the Complainant and Defendant,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 12th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled matter be entered as satisfied and the case closed on the dockets of this Commission.

ORDER No. 4342.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of CHARLES KIRWAN, ET AL.,		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1526.
JOHN J. CARLIN HEATING COMPANY.		

WHEREAS, Charles Kirwan on behalf of himself and of the co-complainants in the above entitled matter did on June fourteenth, 1918, file with this Commission a letter signed by him, withdrawing his complaint against the John J. Carlin Heating Company,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This seventeenth day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled matter be, and it is hereby, dismissed and entered on the Docket of this Commission as satisfied and the case closed.

ORDER No. 4344.

In the Matter of

The Application of SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of the Franchise Granted It by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, by Resolution Dated April 23rd, 1918, Whereby Said Company Is Authorized to Construct a Pole Line on the Jersey Road for the Transmission of Electric Energy.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1531.

WHEREAS, The Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise by it of the franchise granted it by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, by resolution of said County Commissioners adopted on April 23rd, 1918, copy of which resolution is filed in these proceedings, whereby the said Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company is authorized to construct a pole line on the Jersey Road from Salisbury to Delmar for the transmission of electric energy, and

WHEREAS, This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4339 passed June 12th, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of such franchise is necessary and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the exercise by the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company of the franchise granted it by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, by resolution of said County Commissioners adopted on April 23rd, 1918, whereby the said Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company is authorized to construct a pole line on the Jersey Road from Salisbury to Delmar for the transmission of electric energy be, and the same hereby is, permitted and approved.

OPINION

In the Matter of

The Applications of (1) the WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY and (2) THE MARYLAND ELECTRIC RAILWAYS COMPANY for Permission to Make Changes in Their Respective Tariff Schedules on Less Than Statutory Notice.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1535.

By the Commission.

Filed June 19, 1918.

On June 4th, 1918, the above Companies filed their respective applications with this Commission for special permission to make certain radical changes in their existing tariff schedules on one day's notice, but not later than June 10th, 1918.

The more important changes proposed by the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company are as follows:

Increase of one-way fares to three cents per mile. Cancellation of all round-trip fares, except that the Company will sell round-trip tickets at double the one-way fare. Increase of 10 per cent. in fares for monthly commutation tickets. Cancellation of 180-trip quarterly commutation ticket between Baltimore and Naval Academy Junction. Cancellation of 50-trip yearly tickets. Cancellation of special car and special chair car fares. Increase of excess baggage charge per 100 pounds to 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of one-way passenger fare, with minimum of 25 per cent. Withdrawal of stop-over privileges. Cancellation of basing rates of fare.

The changes proposed by The Maryland Electric Railways Company (Annapolis Short Line) are substantially as follows:

Increase of one-way fares to three cents per mile. Cancellation of all round-trip fares. Increase of 10 per cent. in fares for monthly commutation tickets. Increase in charges for special train service for emergency use between Baltimore and Annapolis. Increase in charge for movement of special baggage car. Cancellation of basing rates of fare.

On the date of the filing of the above applications, June 4th, 1918, Edward Chambers, Director of the Division of Traffic, United States Railroad Administration, W. G. McAdoo, Director-General, wrote the Commission a letter as follows:

"Reference is made to the attached copies of petitions filed with your Commission today by the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company and The Maryland Electric Railways Company for permission to advance their local fares between Washington and Baltimore, Baltimore and Annapolis and intermediate stations.

"The purpose of this petition is to bring the local fares of the Companies named up to the minimum basic rate per mile authorized by the Director-General in his Order No. 28 of May 25th, 1918, for roads under Federal control paralleling the electric lines named or having close interchange arrangements with such lines.

"If you can consistently give favorable consideration to the conditions before you enabling the electric lines to increase their fares in the measure therein stated, it will greatly conduce to the interests of parallel and adjacent administration roads and enable them to obtain the full benefit of the increased fares contemplated by the Director-General's Order."

The petitions of the two Companies are almost identical in form and phraseology, and this and the above letter indicate that their filing was suggested by the United States Railroad Administration for the purpose of bringing about increases in rates charged by interurban electric railways throughout the country where they are in competition with steam railroads which have been taken over by the Railroad Administration.

Thus finding these applications endorsed by the Federal Government pursuant to its general financial policy adopted in connection with its operation of the steam railroads of the country, this Commission would, under ordinary circumstances, be strongly inclined to acquiesce in this suggestion of the Federal Government, just as it has heretofore acquiesced in other suggestions coming from the Government in connection with other matters subject to our jurisdiction.

But even where a question of national administrative policy is involved there is still need for an intelligent balancing of the relative convenience and inconvenience, respectively, which may be brought about by any order which this Commission is required to pass pursuant to the authority conferred upon it by the State Legislature.

Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law of this State provides in effect that unless the Commission otherwise orders, no change shall be made in any rate, fare or charge which shall have been filed and published by a common carrier in compliance with the requirements of said Act, except after thirty days' notice to the Commission and publication for thirty days as required by Section 25 thereof; Section 15 further providing that "the Commission, for good cause shown, may allow changes in rates without requiring the thirty days' notice and publication herein provided for, by duly filing and publish-

ing in such manner as it may direct an order specifying the change so made and the time when it shall take effect." Thus the policy of the Legislature is clearly indicated to the effect that in general the public shall have at least thirty days' notice of proposed increases in the rates and fares to be charged by common carriers, subject to the power of this Commission to authorize such increases or changes on less than thirty days' notice where this Commission, in its sound discretion, shall decide that such thirty days' notice is not reasonably required. The object of the thirty days' notice is to give the public an opportunity to object to proposed increases in rates and fares, and thereby enable the Commission to prohibit the same going into effect where they would be excessive or unreasonable. Only in exceptional cases should the Commission deprive the public of this opportunity by passing an order permitting such proposed increases to become immediately effective.

So interpreting this provision of the law, the Public Service Commission of Maryland has always been most loath to authorize material increases in existing rates and charges on less than statutory notice unless the facts of the case showed an urgent necessity therefor.

The petitions of both the carriers in this case contain the following clauses:

"It is hereby certified that in order to defray the increased cost of maintenance and operation fairly chargeable to railway operating expenses and also to pay railway tax other than war tax, net rents for joint facilities and equipment, it is necessary to increase the operating revenues. Since the fares now effective were instituted, the cost of maintenance and operation of the lines of your petitioner have advanced to an unprecedented extent."

However convincing these statements may be when made concerning interurban electric railways generally throughout the United States, and no doubt they are applicable to many of the same, they are by no means convincing when made by the particular carriers whose applications are here involved.

Since the filing of these applications, this Commission has had its Auditor make an examination of the books of the respective Companies, and we find that while it is true as stated in the petition that "the costs of maintenance and operation of the lines of the petitioners have advanced to an unprecedented extent," it is also true that the operating revenues of both these Companies have likewise advanced to an unprecedented extent, far outstripping the advance in operating expenses, and yielding incomes to the stockholders, after all deductions are made, far in excess of those heretofore yielded. This net result in both instances is due largely to war conditions, and it would seem unreasonable in the extreme to give the stockholders of these Companies the full benefit of increased operating costs due to war conditions, without pay-

ing any heed whatsoever to the proportionately much greater operating receipts due likewise to war conditions.

In the case of the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railway Company, which runs directly to Camp Meade, our Auditor's report shows that its railway operating revenues, expenses and net income, after all deductions, increased slightly but steadily during the four months ending April 30th in the years 1914, 1915 and 1916, respectively, but that much greater increases took place during the years 1917 and 1918. During those four months in 1917 the Company's railway operating revenues were \$314,987.88, while during the same four months in 1918 its operating revenues were \$744,074.18. During those four months in 1915 the Company's railway operating expenses were \$197,391.90, some \$40,000 in excess of those for the same period in 1916. During those four months in 1918 the Company's railway operating expenses were \$351,779.78, a tremendous increase over the expenses for the same four months in 1917. But, while the net income, after all deductions, was but \$20,730.08 for those four months in 1915, it was \$260,352.76 during the same four months in 1918. In 1917 (four months) the percentage of railway operating expenses to railway operating revenues was 62.66 per cent., while for the same four months in 1918 the percentage was but 47.28 per cent. A letter from the Company's Auditor to the Auditor of this Commission under date of June 12, 1918, states that the Company was reorganized in 1911 and commenced to pay dividends on preferred stock at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum in 1912, such dividends having been paid in full to date. Common dividends were started in the fall of 1917, 6 per cent. in all being paid on account of that year. The dividend for the first quarter of the year 1918 was at the rate of 2 per cent., which was paid on April 15th.

In the case of The Maryland Electric Railways Company, which operates between Baltimore and Annapolis, the report of our Auditor shows that during the four months ending April 30th, 1917, the Company's gross revenue from operation was \$72,067.77, while during the four months ending April 30th, 1918, its gross revenue from operations was \$142,059.50, an increase of \$69,991.73, or nearly 100 per cent. The Company's operating expenses for the four months ending April 30, 1917, were \$61,976.93, while its operating expenses during the four months ending April 30, 1918, were \$90,908.13, an increase of \$28,931.20, or less than 50 per cent. After all deductions from income, including taxes assignable to railway operations, the Company is shown to have operated at a deficit of \$18,563.48 during the four months ending April 30, 1917, while during the four months ending April 30, 1918, it operated with a net income of \$18,128.23, an increase of \$36,691.71 over the four months in the preceding year.

In all cases involving the rates, fares, rules and regulations of common carriers the rights and convenience of the general public dependent upon them for transportation facilities must be given due

consideration. To what extent these rights and conveniences must yield to the judgment of the United States Railroad Administration as to the steps reasonably required to make its handling of the steam railroads of the country financially profitable, and also to what extent the receipts of the steam roads may be affected adversely by an ultimate refusal on the part of this Commission to permit the proposed increases by these particular electric railway companies, are serious and important questions, and will be given due consideration by this Commission when and if objections are hereafter made to such proposed increases.

For the present this Commission concludes that the exigencies of the situation are not such as to require it to assent at this time to such changes being made on less than statutory notice. Orders will be passed to such effect.

ORDER No. 4345.

In the Matter of

The Applications of (1) the WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY and (2) THE MARYLAND ELECTRIC RAILWAYS COMPANY for Permission to Make Changes in Their Respective Tariff Schedules on Less Than Statutory Notice.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1535.

For the reasons stated in the foregoing opinion it is this 19th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of the Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railroad Company to make effective the changes in its rates, rules and regulations specified in its application of June 4, 1918, on less than thirty days' notice be, and the same is hereby refused.

ORDER No. 4346.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Applications of (1) the WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY and (2) THE MARYLAND ELECTRIC RAILWAYS COMPANY for Permission to Make Changes in Their Respective Tariff Schedules on Less Than Statutory Notice.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1535.

For the reasons stated in the foregoing opinion it is this 19th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of the Maryland Electric Railways Company to make effective the changes in its rates, rules and regulations specified in its application of June 4, 1918, on less than thirty days' notice, be and the same is hereby refused.

ORDER No. 4351.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of JESSE E. TRAVERS for a Permit for the Operation of a Motor Vehicle for Public Use Between Laurel and Baltimore, Maryland.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1530.

WHEREAS, Jesse E. Travers and W. C. White having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of a motor vehicle for public use in the transportation of freight between Laurel, Maryland, and Baltimore, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on for hearing in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4337 passed June 11, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 20th day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of Jesse Travers and W. C. White in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby granted and that the permit applied for be issued between Laurel, Maryland, and Baltimore, Maryland.

ORDER No. 4854.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CECILTON ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of the Franchise Granted It by Its Certificate of Incorporation and by Its Grant from the Town Commissioners of the Town of Cecilton, Cecil County, Maryland, and to Begin Construction Thereunder; and for Authority to Issue \$2,500 Par Value of Its Capital Stock to Cover the Cost of Installation and Construction of Its Plant Within the Town of Cecilton.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1457.

WHEREAS, The Cecilton Electric Light and Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise of the franchises granted it by its certificate of incorporation and by its grant from the Town Commissioners of the town of Cecilton, Cecil County, Maryland, copies of which are filed in these proceedings, and to begin construction thereunder; and for authority to issue \$2,500 par value of its capital stock to cover the cost of installation and construction of its plant within the town of Cecilton, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4157 passed February 19, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of said franchises and the construction thereunder is necessary and convenient for the public service and that the issue of said capital stock is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 20th day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the exercise by The Cecilton Electric Light and Power Company of the franchises granted it by its certificate of incorporation and by its grant from the Town Commissioners of the town of Cecilton, Cecil County, Maryland, and the construction thereunder be, and the same hereby are, permitted and approved.

2. That the issue and sale at par for cash by said The Cecilton Electric Light and Power Company of \$2,500 par value of its capital stock for the acquisition of property and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its plant and distributing system is hereby authorized and approved.

3. That said The Cecilton Electric Light and Power Company shall make reports to this Commission duly verified by affidavits as follows:

(a) Upon the sale for cash of its stock, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such sale or sales, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said stock, and the facts and circumstances as to the property acquired and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its plant and distributing system.

ORDER No. 4356.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of a Franchise Granted It by Resolution of County Commissioners of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, Dated May 14th, 1918.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1532.

Ordered, This 21st day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, that the permission and approval of the Commission be, and the same are hereby, given to the acceptance by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore of the franchise granted it by grant of the County Commissioners of Anne Arundel County, dated May 14, 1918, to wit: "To construct, operate and maintain a double track line, with all necessary overhead wires and other overhead and side pole construction on Curtis Avenue, Anne Arundel County, beginning at the end of the existing tracks on Curtis Avenue near Blossom Street, and connecting therewith, and extending thence southerly along Curtis Avenue to Alder Street, a distance of approximately nine hundred and fifty feet (950), thence curving westerly across the intersection of Curtis Avenue and Alder Street into private property located at the southwest corner of Curtis Avenue and Alder Street; and to run on the aforesaid tracks cars propelled by electricity or other improved motive power other than steam," said franchise to be exercised in accordance with the provisions of said grant in every particular, this Commission having determined, after due hearing, that such exercise of the grant is convenient for the public service.

ORDER No. 4357.

In the Matter of

The Joint Application of THE MARYLAND ELECTRIC RAILWAYS COMPANY and THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of the Franchises Granted Said Maryland Electric Railways Company by County Commissioners of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, by Resolution Dated May 28, 1918, and by an Agreement Between The Maryland Electric Railways Company and State Roads Commission, Dated May 21, 1918.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1533.

WHEREAS, The Maryland Electric Railways Company and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore have applied to this Commission for its permission and approval of the franchises granted to said The Maryland Electric Railways Company by the County Commissioners of Anne Arundel County, as set forth in "Exhibit A" filed in these proceedings, and by the State Roads Commission of Maryland, as set forth in "Exhibit B," filed in these proceedings, and for the construction by The Maryland Electric Railways Company of the railway to be constructed in pursuance of said franchises, and the possession and use thereof by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, in accordance with the terms of the Lease and Agreement between said corporations, under date of September 15, 1906, a copy of which, marked "Exhibit B," is filed in Case No. 29 of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, This Commission has determined, after due hearing, that the exercise of said franchises and the construction, possession and use of said railway is convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 21st day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the exercise by The Maryland Electric Railways Company of the franchise granted to it by the County Commissioners of Anne Arundel County on May 28, 1918, to wit: "To construct, operate and maintain a double track line with all necessary overhead wires and other overhead and side pole construction on Patapsco Avenue, Anne Arundel County, beginning at a point on the existing tracks of The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore on Patapsco Avenue, a short distance west of Pennington Avenue; thence along Patapsco Avenue to its intersection with Stone House Cove Road at a point about one hundred feet west of the bridge on the Curtis Bay

Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, there to connect with tracks to be constructed on Stone House Cove Road under franchise from the State Roads Commission; and also to construct, operate and maintain a single track line with all necessary overhead wires and other overhead and side pole construction, beginning at the intersection of Stone House Cove Road and School House Lane, and there connecting with the tracks to be laid on said Stone House Cove Road under franchise from the State Roads Commission; thence extending along the east side of School House Lane in a northerly direction to Chesapeake Avenue, or Fourth Avenue, Fairfield; thence extending along the south side of said Chesapeake Avenue, or Fourth Avenue, in a westerly direction to a point about three hundred feet west of Ninth Street; thence in a southerly direction along the western side of the new highway to be opened up by the County Commissioners connecting Chesapeake Avenue with Stone House Cove Road, and there to connect with the most northerly track of the double track railway to be laid on Stone House Cove Road under franchise from the State Roads Commission, as shown on blue print No. 9972-11, entitled 'U. R. & E. Co., Proposed Extension from Patapsco and Pennington Avenues to Fairfield,' dated November 30, 1917; and to run on the aforesaid tracks cars propelled by electricity or other improved motive power other than steam," and subject to the conditions, stipulations and agreements therein contained, as set forth in said "Exhibit A," filed in these proceedings, be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

2. That the exercise by said The Maryland Electric Railways Company of the franchise granted to it by the State Roads Commission of Maryland, on May 21, 1918, to wit: "To construct and maintain, lay down and operate, a railway track or tracks to be operated by electricity or other improved motive power other than steam, with the necessary overhead wires and overhead construction, and with the necessary switches and turnouts, beginning at a point on Patapsco Avenue, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, where the County road joins the State road, said point being located about one hundred feet west of the bridge carrying the Curtis Bay Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; thence extending along said Patapsco Avenue, in an easterly direction and crossing under said railroad bridge, for a distance of approximately four hundred feet to Stone House Cove Road; thence continuing with a single track along the north side of Stone House Cove Road to School House Lane," subject to the conditions, stipulations and agreements set forth in said "Exhibit B," filed in these proceedings, be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

3. That authority is hereby given to The Maryland Electric Railways Company to construct said railway as provided in said grants, and to The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore to take possession of said railway and use the same, in accordance with the terms of the Lease and Agreement hereinbefore referred to, the same being "Exhibit B," filed in Case No. 29 of this Commission.

ORDER No. 4358.

In the Matter of	}	
The Complaint of J. A. HUGHES, ET AL., Residents of Essex, Baltimore County, Maryland,		Before the
<i>vs.</i>		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.		Case No. 1428.

WHEREAS, Complaint having been made to this Commission respecting the failure of the respondent to extend its electric wires to Essex, Baltimore County, Maryland, to supply service to prospective users of electricity at said point, and

WHEREAS, The complaint having come on for hearing and the Commission being of opinion and finding after hearing and full investigation that the extension aforesaid should be made by the respondent at its own expense when a sufficient number of such prospective patrons had wired their premises and were ready to receive service from the respondent's lines to justify such extension, and

WHEREAS, It now appears that the respondent has undertaken to make the necessary extension under the conditions prescribed by the Commission, which arrangement is satisfactory to the complainants, as evidenced by letter from complainants dated June 18, 1918, filed herein,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 21st day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and it is hereby, entered as satisfied.

ORDER No. 4363.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated November 15, 1917, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on West Side of Cairnes Lane, 91 Feet North of North Curb Line of Union Avenue in the City of Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1545.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-fourth day of June, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4364.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated April 10, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of 14 Poles and 3 Anchor Guys Located on Beech Street and on Private Property North of Beech Street, Due East of Railroad Avenue, Curtis Bay, Fifth District, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1546.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-fourth day of June, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4365.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated May 7, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on the South Side of Hollins Street, East of Calverton Road, Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1547.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-fourth day of June, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4366.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated May 7, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on the West Side of Morris Street, 9 Feet South of the North Building Line of 2529 Madison Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1548.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-fourth day of June, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby, given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4368.

In the Matter of

The Application of BALTIMORE, CHESAPEAKE AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Extension of Its Freight Siding at Rockawalkin, Wicomico County, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1549.

WHEREAS, It appears from the petition and exhibit filed in the above entitled matter that the proposed extension of the siding at Rockawalkin is necessary and convenient for the public service and the Com-

mission being of the opinion that the proposed extension is not a matter of such character as to necessitate a formal hearing under the terms and provisions of Section 26 of the Public Service Commission Act,

It Is, THEREFORE, This twenty-fifth day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, —

Ordered, That the proposed extension of the siding at Rockwalkin, Somerset County, Maryland, be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4370.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of the HAGERSTOWN AND FREDERICK RAILWAY COMPANY for Per- mission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff Changing the Reciprocal Switching Rate in Frederick, Maryland.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 536.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 25th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given the Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff changing the reciprocal switching rate in Frederick, Maryland, from \$5.00 per car to \$6.50 per car, the switching charges under the increased rate to be absorbed by connecting carriers and no portion thereof to be borne by the shipping public,

PROVIDED, Tariff containing said rate be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4370, of date June 25, 1918."

ORDER No. 4372.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$20,000,000 of Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1543.

WHEREAS, The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company has filed with this Commission an application from which it appears that said company has expended upon the railroads and property subject to its Refunding and General Mortgage from December 1, 1917, to April 30, 1918, inclusive, \$1,918,302.54, for which no bonds have been issued under said mortgage or other mortgages of said company; and that said company has advanced to The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company for construction and acquisition of property \$1,150,000, for which it will receive the bonds of The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company and will deposit them under its Refunding and General Mortgage and have issued to it Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds to a like amount; and that the President and Directors of said company, with the approval of the Director-General of Railroads, have authorized certain expenditures estimated to cost more than \$20,000,000; and said company desires to issue and sell or pledge its Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds, Series A, to an amount not exceeding \$20,000,000 in reimbursement for expenditures already made, as above recited, and expenditures to be hereafter made for extensions, improvements and the acquisition of additional property, authorized as aforesaid; and the Commission being of opinion that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of such bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of the said corporation;

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-sixth day of June, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the issue and sale or pledge of \$20,000,000 of said Refunding and General Mortgage Bonds, Series A, of The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, for the uses and purposes aforesaid, be and the same is hereby approved.

ORDER No. 4375.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE HAGERSTOWN
AND FREDERICK RAILWAY COMPANY for
Authority to Issue \$100,000 Par Value
of Its First and Refunding Bonds,
Proceeds from the Sale of Said Bonds
to be Used for Refunding Outstanding
Obligations and for Other Lawful
Corporate Purposes.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1544.

The above entitled matter having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4362, passed June 21, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the issue by the applicant, The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company, of \$100,000 par value of its First and Refunding Mortgage Thirty-Year Sinking Fund Gold Bonds, Six Per Cent. Series, is reasonably required for the purpose of said corporation,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 27th day of June, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the applicant, The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company, be and it is hereby authorized to issue and deliver not exceeding \$100,000, face amount, of its First and Refunding Mortgage Thirty-Year Sinking Fund Gold Bonds, Six Per Cent. Series, and to sell \$35,000 of face amount thereof so as to net said The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company not less than \$33,250 and to use the remaining \$65,000 face amount of bonds for collateral purposes as mentioned in said petition, and with the further right to the said Company to sell and dispose of the said \$65,000 face amount of bonds, or any part thereof, at any time, at not less than 95 per cent. of the face value of the same; the proceeds to be applied as in said petition set forth, the Commission having determined that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of said bonds is reasonably required for the purpose of said Company, to wit: the lawful discharge and refunding of its obligations.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company shall make reports to this Commission duly verified by affidavits upon the issuance and delivery of said bonds, and if the same are sold, the amount thereof so sold and the price obtained therefor.

ORDER No. 4377.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of a Franchise Granted It by Ordinance No. 365 of the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Approved June 5, 1918.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1540.

Ordered, This 28th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, that the permission and approval of the Commission be, and the same are hereby, given to the acceptance by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore of the franchise granted it by Ordinance No. 365 of the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, approved June 5, 1918, and copy of which is filed in these proceedings, to wit: "To construct double tracks on Carrollton Avenue, between Fayette and Baltimore Streets, with double track connecting curves around the northeast corner of Baltimore Street and Carrollton Avenue; to construct a single track connecting curve around the southwest corner of Fayette Street and Carrollton Avenue connecting the easternmost track on Carrollton Avenue with the northernmost track on Fayette Street; to construct a single track on Carrollton Avenue from the north side of Fayette Street to the south side of Fayette Street connecting the present track on Carrollton Avenue above Fayette Street with the proposed southbound track on Carrollton Avenue between Fayette and Baltimore Streets; to extend its double tracks on Paca Street across Fayette Street, to connect with its tracks to the north and south thereof, and to construct double track connecting curves around the southeast corner of Paca and Fayette Streets; to construct double track connecting curves around the southwest corner of Paca and Baltimore Streets; to construct double track connecting curves around the northeast corner of Paca and Lombard Streets and double track connecting curves around the northwest corner of Paca and Lombard Streets; to extend its double tracks on Eutaw Street across Baltimore Street to connect with its tracks to the north and south thereof; to extend its double tracks on German Street, from Howard Street to Eutaw Street, with double track connecting curves around the northeast corner of German and Eutaw Streets; to extend its double tracks on Lombard Street across Howard and Liberty Streets, one track to connect with its existing track on Lombard Street and the other to connect with an additional track thereon to be laid hereunder, with an additional connecting curve around the northeast corner of Lombard and Liberty Streets; to construct an additional track on Lombard Street from Liberty to South Street; to construct a single track connecting curve around the south-

west corner of Lombard and South Streets, connecting the southernmost track on Lombard Street with the westernmost track on South Street; to extend the double tracks on Calvert Street, from Baltimore Street to Lombard Street, and a single track on Calvert Street, from Lombard to Pratt Street, with a single track curve around the northeast corner connecting with the northernmost track on Pratt Street; also a single track curve around the northeast corner of Calvert and Lombard Streets, connecting the westernmost track on Calvert Street with the southernmost track on Lombard Street; to construct a single track curve around the southwest corner of Calvert and Lombard Streets, connecting the single track on Calvert Street with the northernmost track on Lombard Street, and a single track curve around the southeast corner of Calvert and Lombard Streets, connecting the single track on Calvert Street with the southernmost track on Lombard Street; to construct double track connecting curves around the southwest corner of Baltimore and Charles Streets; to construct single track connecting curve around the southwest corner of Lombard and Albemarle Streets, from the southernmost track on Lombard Street to the single track on Albemarle Street; to construct a single track connecting curve around the southwest corner of Lombard and High Streets, from the northernmost track on Lombard Street to the single track on High Street; to construct double track connecting curves around the southeast corner of Preston Street and Park Avenue; and to run on the aforesaid tracks cars to be propelled by electricity or by the storage system or by any improved system which may be approved by the Mayor and Highways Engineer"; said franchise to be exercised in accordance with the provisions of said Ordinance in every particular, this Commission having determined, after due hearing, that such exercise of the franchise is convenient for the public service.

ORDER No. 4378.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for Permission to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement No. 28 to Petitioner's Electric Rate Schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 537.</p>
---	---	--

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 28th day of June, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore to file and publish on not less than one day's notice to the Commission and the public, Supplement No. 28 to petitioner's electric rate schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4, said supplement to publish rates for "Schedule R, Electrolytic Copper Refining Rates,"

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4378 of date June 28, 1918."

PROVIDED, FURTHER, That this Commission by passing this order is not to be taken or construed as in any sense whatsoever passing upon the reasonableness of the rates contained in supplement filed hereunder, or of waiving or determining any issue presented in any proceeding now pending before this Commission, such rates being left as fully subject to investigation and correction upon complaint or upon the Commission's own motion as if this order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4380.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE AMERICAN RAILWAY EXPRESS COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Tariffs Increasing Existing Express Rates and Charges of Express Companies Taken Over and Operated by the Petitioner Applicable to Intrastate Traffic in Maryland Ten (10) Per Cent.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 538.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 1st day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby, given The American Railway Express Company to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, tariffs increasing existing express rates and charges of express companies applicable to intrastate traffic in the State of Maryland ten (10) per cent.; in establishing the

increased rates fractions one-half cent or less shall be discarded and fractions more than one-half cent shall be treated as one cent, except that in establishing increased commodity rates which apply per pound fractions shall be retained,

PROVIDED, Said tariffs containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4380, of date July 1, 1918."

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That by passing this order the Public Service Commission is not to be taken as in any sense whatever approving any rates that may be filed under the authority of this order; all such rates being left as fully subject to investigation and correction on complaint, or on the Commission's own motion under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law as if this order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4382.

In the Matter of

The Petition of THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, by H. C. Smith, Its Freight Tariff Agent, on Behalf of Said Company and All Other Common Carriers in the State of Maryland, for an Order or Orders Relieving Said Petitioners from the Provisions of Section No. 15 and Section No. 19 of the Public Service Commission Law of Maryland, Etc.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1489.

The petitioners in the above entitled matter by their attorney having withdrawn their petition,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the withdrawal of the petition in this case be, and it is hereby, permitted.

ORDER No. 4383.

In the Matter of

The Application of the WASHINGTON, BRANDYWINE AND POINT LOOKOUT RAILROAD for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of Its Franchise Under Its Certificate of Incorporation and for Authority to Issue \$100,000 of Its Common Stock and \$75,000 Par Value of Its First Mortgage Bonds.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1538.

WHEREAS, The Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company, a corporation organized under the general laws of the State of Maryland, having applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise of its franchise as a common carrier under its certificate of incorporation and for authority to issue and sell \$100,000 par value of its common capital stock and to issue \$75,000 face value of its Two-Year Six Per Cent. First Mortgage Bonds and to deposit said bonds as collateral to secure a loan of \$50,000 from the United States Railroad Administration, said bonds to be secured by a mortgage or deed of trust of all of the property, rights and franchises of the said Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on to be heard after the notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4349 passed June 19, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of said franchise is necessary and convenient for the public service and that the issue and sale of said common capital stock and the issue of said Two-Year Six Per Cent. First Mortgage Bonds and the deposit of said bonds as collateral to secure a loan of \$50,000 from the United States Railroad Administration are reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation, to wit: the acquisition of property, the construction, completion, extension, improvement and maintenance of its facilities, the improvement and maintenance of its service, and the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 2nd day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the exercise by the Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company of the franchise granted it by its certificate of incorporation and the right to begin construction be, and the same hereby are, permitted and approved.

2. That the issue and sale at par for cash by the said Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company of \$100,000 par

value of its common capital stock, and the issue by said company of \$75,000 face value of its Two-Year Six Per Cent. First Mortgage Bonds and the deposit of said bonds as collateral to secure a loan of \$50,000 from the United States Railroad Administration be, and the same hereby are, permitted and approved.

3. That the said Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company shall file with this Commission a certified copy of the mortgage or deed of trust to secure the aforesaid bonds upon the execution thereof.

4. That the said Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Company shall make reports to this Commission duly verified by affidavits as follows:

(a) Upon the issue and sale for cash of its stock or the issue of its bonds, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue or sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said stock, and the disposition of said bonds, and the facts and circumstances as to the property acquired, the construction, completion, extension, improvement and maintenance of its facilities, the improvement and maintenance of its service, and the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations.

ORDER No. 4384.

In the Matter of
The Application of THE UNITED RAIL-
WAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BAL-
TIMORE for an Order Permitting and
Approving the Removal of Five Hun-
dred Feet of Its Southernmost Double
Tracks on Light Street, Baltimore,
Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1541.

This case coming on to be heard, after due notice published in compliance with Order No. 4353 of this Commission, passed June 20, 1918, and no protest thereto having been made, and the Commission having determined after hearing that the 500 feet of The United Railways and Electric Company's southernmost double tracks on Light Street, being the 500 feet of double track on the approach to the north end of the old Light Street Bridge, as mentioned in the petition of The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and as shown in red on

blue print attached to said petition, are no longer necessary or convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 2nd day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the approval and permission of the Commission is hereby given to the removal of 500 feet of The United Railways and Electric Company's southernmost double tracks on Light Street, being the 500 feet of double track on the approach to the north end of the old Light Street Bridge, as mentioned in the petition of The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and as shown in red on the blue print attached to said petition.

ORDER No. 4385.

In the Matter of

The Investigation by the Commission on
Its Own Motion of the Heating of Cars
of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, the Enclosing
of the Vestibules of Said Cars, and of
the Equipment of Said Cars, with Safety
Appliances for the Protection of the
Public on the Streets of Baltimore City.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 676.

WHEREAS, This Commission by its Order No. 2545 entered herein on December 4, 1915, directed and required The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore to, among other things, proceed with the work of vestibuling all of its semi-convertible open-platform cars by installing suitable doors with simultaneously operated steps, folding up when doors are closed and vice versa, said work of vestibuling to be prosecuted at the rate of twelve (12) cars per month until completed, and

WHEREAS, The work aforesaid has since proceeded up to January 1, 1918, at the rate required by the Commission's order, and

WHEREAS, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore has now petitioned the Commission to suspend the operation of its Order No. 2545 aforesaid so far as same requires said company to vestibule twelve (12) cars per month, until such time as labor and other conditions become more near normal, it being alleged by the company that the services of all the mechanics in its employ at the present time are needed to make the ordinary and routine repairs of its cars so as to make said cars safe for operation, and that on account of the unprecedented demand for mechanics at the various plants in and

around Baltimore engaged in ship building and other activities incident to and necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, the company has been and is now unable to secure additional mechanics to enable it to continue the vestibuling of its cars, and

WHEREAS, The Chief Engineer and the Transportation Expert of this Commission have, by direction of the Commission, investigated the matter presented by the company's petition, and have in a joint report rendered the Commission under date of June 29, 1918, recommended to the Commission that it suspend the requirements of its Order No. 2545 respecting the vestibuling of cars until labor conditions improve or until the company is able to secure sufficient men over and above those absolutely required for the maintenance of the running equipment of said company,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 2nd day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That from and after January 1, 1918, and continuing until the further order of this Commission in the premises, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore be, and it hereby is, relieved from the requirements of this Commission's Order No. 2545 entered on December 4, 1915, so far as said order requires said company to vestibule twelve (12) cars per month,

PROVIDED, That when labor conditions become more near normal or when the railways company is able to secure sufficient men to enable it to again proceed with the work of vestibuling its cars, such work shall again be taken up and prosecuted to a conclusion, as by Order No. 2545 aforesaid required, subject to the further right of this Commission to at any time withdraw the suspension afforded by this order and to restore the requirements of Order No. 2545 from and after the withdrawal of such suspension.

ORDER No. 4386.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of CHESTERTOWN AND ELKTON BUS LINE, INC., for an Order Permitting and Approving the Discon- tinuance of Its Operations and Service.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1550.

This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4369 passed June 25, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission having determined after due hearing that the exercise of the franchise of the applicant is no longer necessary or convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 3rd day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the applicant, the said Chestertown and Elkton Bus Line, Inc., be and it is hereby authorized to abandon the franchise previously exercised by it and to cease doing business as a common carrier within the State of Maryland from and after the date hereof.

ORDER No. 4395.

In the Matter of The Application of MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise by It of Its Franchise as a Common Carrier and of Its Operation of a Railroad Under Such Franchise.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1521.
---	---	---

WHEREAS, The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, a municipal corporation, has applied to this Commission for an Order permitting and approving the exercise by it of its franchise as a common carrier granted it under its charter and of its operation of a railroad heretofore constructed in the City of Baltimore under such franchise, the route of which railroad is described in the application herein and by map filed with said application, marked "Exhibit A," and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4324 passed May 27, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after hearing that the exercise of such franchise and the operation of said railroad is necessary and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 9th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the exercise by the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, a municipal corporation, of its franchise as a common carrier granted it under its charter and of its operation of a railroad heretofore constructed in the City of Baltimore under such franchise, the route of which railroad is more particularly described in the application herein and by map filed with said application, marked "Exhibit A," be and the same are hereby permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4396.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for an Order Permitting and Approving the Execution by It of a Contract Between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore for the Leasing by It of Fifty (50) Cars Fully Equipped for Operation to Be Purchased by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Subject to the Terms and Conditions Contained in Said Agreement.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1561.

WHEREAS, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore has applied to the Public Service Commission of Maryland for its permission and approval to execute a contract between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore for the leasing of fifty (50) cars fully equipped for operation, to be purchased by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, subject to the terms and conditions contained in said contract, copy of which has heretofore been filed with the Commission, and

WHEREAS, The Commission has examined said contract and finds that the execution of the same by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore is convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 9th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the approval and permission of the Commission is hereby given to the execution by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore of said contract between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, for the leasing by it of fifty (50) cars fully equipped for operation to be purchased by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, subject to the terms and conditions therein contained,

PROVIDED, That when the total price to be paid for the cars in question by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation is determined upon, said amount shall be forthwith reported to this Commission by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and should said The United Railways and Electric Com-

pany of Baltimore acquire said cars under the terms of the aforesaid contract, the amount paid by said Company for said cars shall likewise be forthwith reported to this Commission.

ORDER No. 4397.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of WILLIAM H. STINSON		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY.		Case No. 1522.

This case being at issue upon complaint and answer on file and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that the toll rate of ten cents at present charged by The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City for telephonic communications of five minutes or fraction thereof between subscribers in its Sykesville Central Office District and subscribers in its Ellicott City Central Office District, and between subscribers in its Elkridge Central Office District and subscribers in its Ellicott City Central Office District, is unjust and unreasonable, and that the just and reasonable charge for telephonic communications of five minutes or fraction thereof between subscribers in the central office districts aforesaid is five cents,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 10th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City be, and it is hereby, directed and required to establish on or before July 21, 1918, a toll rate of five cents for telephonic communications of five minutes or fraction thereof between subscribers in its Sykesville Central Office District and subscribers in its Ellicott City Central Office District, and between subscribers in its Elkridge Central Office District and subscribers in its Ellicott City Central Office District, and to thereafter maintain said toll rate until the further order of this Commission in the premises,

PROVIDED, That this Order and the rate thereby established are without prejudice with respect to any subsequent State-wide or general readjustment of the rates of the respondent company involved by any plan now before the Commission or hereafter presented to it.

ORDER No. 4398.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of MARYLAND, DELAWARE AND VIRGINIA RAILWAY COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Construction of Siding at Centre- ville, Queen Anne's County, Maryland.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1562.

WHEREAS, It appears from the petition and exhibits filed in the above entitled matter that the proposed construction of a side track at Centreville is necessary and convenient for the public service, and the Commission being of the opinion that a hearing under the terms and provisions of Section 26 of the Public Service Commission Law is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This tenth day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the construction of the side track at Centreville, Maryland, as proposed in the above entitled application be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4399.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of E. M. YOUNG to Operate Motor Vehicle for Public Use Between Frederick and Baltimore, Maryland.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1539.

WHEREAS, E. M. Young having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of a motor vehicle for public use for the transportation of passengers between Frederick, Maryland, and Baltimore, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on for hearing on July 2, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4350 passed June 19, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 10th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of E. M. Young in this case exhibited be, and it is hereby granted, and that the permit applied for be issued between Frederick, Maryland, and Baltimore, Maryland.

ORDER No. 4400.

In the Matter of

The Recommendation of UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION, by P. B. Noyes, Its Director of Conservation, and F. A. Meyer, Fuel Administrator of This State, that the "Stagger Stop" Be Permitted and Put in Effect by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore as a War Measure for the Conservation of Fuel.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1506.

The petitions of the West Forest Park Protective and Improvement Association and others having been duly investigated by the Commission and its Transportation Expert having recommended the restoration of the stop covered by said petitions, and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore having orally waived its right to a hearing, it is this 10th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore forthwith restore the southbound stop on Liberty Road, after rounding the curve from Gwynn Oak Avenue, making said stop in front of the Community Building, on the Woodlawn branch of the Linden Avenue line of the respondent company;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a copy of this Order be forthwith served upon the proper representatives of said The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that said company notify this Commission within five days after the receipt of said copy whether or not it will accept and abide by this Order.

ORDER No. 4401.

In the Matter of

The Recommendation of UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION, by P. B. Noyes, Its Director of Conservation, and F. A. Meyer, Fuel Administrator of This State, that the "Stagger Stop" Be Permitted and Put in Effect by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore as a War Measure for the Conservation of Fuel.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1506.

The petition of the Windsor Hills Improvement Association having been duly investigated by the Commission and its Transportation Expert having recommended the restoration of the stop covered by said petition, and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore having orally waived its right to a hearing, it is this 10th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore forthwith restore the westbound stop at Oakdale Station on the Windsor Hills line of the respondent company;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a copy of this Order be forthwith served upon the proper representatives of said The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that said company notify this Commission within five days after the receipt of said copy whether or not it will accept and abide by this Order.

ORDER No. 4402.

In the Matter of

The Application of HARRY B. FILLINGAME and JOHN S. KRASTEL for a Permit for the Operation of a Motor Vehicle for Public Use Between Chesapeake City and Elkton, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1377.

WHEREAS, Harry B. Fillingame and John S. Krastel having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of a motor vehicle for public use between Chesapeake City and Elkton, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, This Commission by its Order No. 3786, entered on August 3, 1917, refused and dismissed the application, it having been the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience did not require the granting of said permit, but that on the contrary the granting of such a permit would be prejudicial to the welfare and convenience of the public, and

WHEREAS, The applicants having petitioned the Commission for a re-hearing, which re-hearing was duly had, and the Commission at the conclusion thereof being still of the opinion and finding that the public welfare and convenience do not require the granting of the permit prayed for,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 11th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the application of Harry B. Fillingame and John S. Krastel in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby refused and dismissed, and Order No. 3786 entered herein on August 3, 1917, be, and it is hereby, confirmed.

ORDER No. 4403.

In the Matter of

The Application of CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, Dated June 21, 1918, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on the South Side of Gorsuch Avenue, 22 Feet West of the West Building Line of Montibello Avenue in the City of Baltimore, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1563.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this eleventh day of July, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be, and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4404.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE TRAPPE ELECTRIC
LIGHT COMPANY for an Order Permit-
ting and Approving the Exercise of Its
Franchise Under Its Certificate of
Incorporation and Under the Franchise
Granted It by Ordinance No. 100
Ordained and Enacted November 17,
1917, by the Commissioners of Trappe.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1554.

WHEREAS, The Trappe Electric Light Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise of the franchises granted it under its certificate of incorporation, and by Ordinance No. 100 of the Commissioners of Trappe enacted November 17, 1917, certified copies of which certificate of incorporation and ordinance are filed in these proceedings, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4881 passed July 1, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of said franchises is necessary and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 12th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the exercise of The Trappe Electric Light Company of the franchises granted it under its certificate of incorporation, and by Ordinance No. 100 of the Commissioners of Trappe enacted November 17, 1917, be and the same hereby is permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4405.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of THE SOUTHERN MARYLAND TRANSIT COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Discontinuance of Its Motor Vehicle Service for Public Use Between Camp Parole, Anne Arundel County, and Solomon's Island, Calvert County, Maryland.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1556.</p>
--	---	---

This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4388 passed July 5, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission having determined after due hearing that the exercise of the franchise of the applicant is no longer necessary or convenient for the public service, in view of the fact that the passenger bus line of applicant has been operated at a considerable loss to the applicant,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 12th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the applicant, said The Southern Maryland Transit Company, be and it is hereby authorized to abandon the franchise previously exercised by it and to cease doing business as a common carrier within the State of Maryland from and after the date hereof.

ORDER No. 4406.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of the COMMISSIONERS OF HURLOCK</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>THE BALTIMORE, CHESAPEAKE AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON RAILROAD COMPANY, Lessee.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1356.</p>
---	---	---

Upon the order of the Solicitor for the Complainant filed herein, it is this twelfth day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4407.

In the Matter of	Before the
Conference with Officials of Railroads and Other Common Carriers Respect- ing Increase in Maryland Intrastate Freight Rates.	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	Case No. 1341.

It appearing from the papers in this case, and more particularly from letter of General Counsel of The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company filed herein bearing date of July 11, 1918, that the matters presented in this conference have been concluded,

It IS, THEREFORE, This 12th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the above entitled case be and it is hereby entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4408.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Complaint of H. P. GEOGHEGAN	Public Service Commission
vs.	of Maryland.
THE CAMBRIDGE GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.	Case No. 1520.

It appearing from the papers in this case, and more particularly from letter of complainant filed herein bearing date of July 11, 1918, that the complaint has been satisfied,

It IS, THEREFORE, This 12th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be and it is hereby entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4409.

In the Matter of

The Application of the SALISBURY LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of a Franchise Granted It by Resolutions of the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, Adopted at a Meeting Held on December 18, 1917, Authorizing Said Company to Erect Poles and String Wires Thereon on Salisbury-Quantico Road from the Town Limits of Salisbury to Rockawalkin Station and on Certain Streets in the Town of Hebron and on the Hebron-Quantico Road and Hebron-Rewastico Road to Spring Hill Church.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1553.

WHEREAS, The Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise by it of the franchise granted it by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, by resolutions of said County Commissioners adopted on December 18, 1917, copies of which resolutions are filed in these proceedings, whereby the said Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company is authorized to erect poles and string wires thereon on Salisbury-Quantico Road from the town limits of Salisbury to Rockawalkin Station and on certain streets in the town of Hebron and on the Hebron-Quantico Road and Hebron-Rewastico Road to Spring Hill Church for the transmission of electric energy, and

WHEREAS, This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4379 passed June 28, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of such franchise is necessary and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 16th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the exercise by the Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company of the franchise granted it by the County Commissioners of Wicomico County, Maryland, by resolutions of said County Commissioners adopted on December 18, 1917, whereby the said Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company is authorized to erect poles and string wires thereon on Salisbury-Quantico Road from the town limits of Salisbury to Rockawalkin Station and on certain streets in the town

of Hebron and on the Hebron-Quantico Road and Hebron-Rewastico Road to Spring Hill Church for the transmission of electric energy be, and the same hereby is, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4411.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of WILLIAM H. MACKALL, President, Town Commissioners of Elkton,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>MARYLAND WATER COMPANY OF CECIL COUNTY.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1381.</p>
---	---	---

WHEREAS, The Public Service Commission has been credibly informed that on or about June 24, 1918, a corporation, styled the Elkton Water Works, Inc., was formed for the purpose of taking over the water plant and other assets of the Maryland Water Company of Cecil county, and of operating said water plant; and that a few days later it did actually take over said water plant and other assets, and is now the owner thereof, and affected with all the public obligations under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law of a water company; and,

WHEREAS, It has been suggested to the said Commission that it is expedient to make the said Elkton Water Works, Inc., a party defendant to these proceedings before a final order is passed herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, It is this sixteenth day of July, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the said Elkton Water Works, Inc., be and it is hereby made a party defendant to these proceedings; and that a copy of the complaint in these proceedings and of this order be forwarded to it, and that the matters complained of be satisfied by it within ten (10) days of the service of said complaint and order, or that the complaint be answered in writing by it within ten (10) days of the service of said complaint and order; with the privilege to the said Elkton Water Works, Inc., to take such further testimony in these proceedings as it may deem advisable, at a hearing to be fixed by the said Commission immediately upon the filing of said answer, unless the taking of such testimony shall be waived by the said Elkton Water Works, Inc.

ORDER No. 4412.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated March 19, 1918, Between It and CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Six Poles, Located in the City of Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1565.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this sixteenth day of July, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4413.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

vs.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THURMONT, a Municipal Corporation Engaged in the Business of Manufacturing and Supplying Electricity for Other Than Municipal Purposes, with Respect to the Fairness and Reasonableness of Its Rates and Charges.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1444.

WHEREAS, It appears from the papers filed in this case, and particularly from the letter of the General Counsel of this Commission, filed herein on the date hereof, that the complaint has been satisfied,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This eighteenth day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That said complaint be entered as satisfied and the case closed.

ORDER No. 4416.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Application of the WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION for Authority to Issue \$50,000 of Its Five Per Cent. Bonds.	Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1524.

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, a body corporate created by Chapter 122 of the Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, session of 1918, for the purpose of supplying water and sewerage facilities for the territory in the State of Maryland immediately adjacent to the District of Columbia, and for the regulation of matters relating to the public health in said territory, has applied to this Commission for authority to issue \$50,000 face amount of bonds of the said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, said bonds to bear interest at rate of Five Per Cent. (5%) per annum, payable semi-annually and to mature in not less than thirty nor more than fifty years from date of issuance, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on June 11, 1918, after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4326 passed June 3, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the issue of said bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation as set forth in the application herein,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the issue and sale for cash at not less than par by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission of its Five Per Cent. (5%) 30-50 year bonds to the face amount of \$50,000 is hereby permitted and approved.

2. That the said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission shall make reports to this Commission, duly verified by affidavits, as follows:

(a) Upon the sale for cash of its bonds, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such sale or sales, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said bonds.

ORDER No. 4418.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the CARRIERS NOT UNDER FEDERAL CONTROL Named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement No. 25 to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 539.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 20th day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, the carriers not under Federal control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their agent, to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, supplement No. 25 to Official Classification No. 44 P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, canceling Supplement No. 21 to P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44 which supplement postponed until July 29, 1918, the Automobile Body items in Supplement No. 15 to P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44 and also canceling the Automobile Body items appearing on page 49, item 7, of Supplement No. 15 to P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, and items 28, 29 and 30, page 358, and items 38, 39 and 40, page 360, of P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, and establishing in lieu thereof the ratings set forth in petition herein,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4418 of date July 20, 1918."

ORDER No. 4421.

In the Matter of
 The Complaint of J. COHEN
 vs.
 ARTESIAN WATER COMPANY.

Before the
 Public Service Commission
 of Maryland.
 Case No. 1557.

This case being at issue upon complaint and answer on file and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that the amount of \$15 heretofore paid by the complainant to the Suburban Water Company for service connection to supply premises 5202 Park Heights Avenue, Baltimore County, Maryland, should properly be credited by the respondent company to said complainant as an offset against the charge for service connection now demanded to supply the premises aforesaid,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 23rd day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That The Artesian Water Company be, and it is hereby, directed to install service connection to supply premises 5202 Park Heights Avenue, Baltimore County, Maryland, upon payment by J. Cohen, the complainant herein, of the difference in charges for such connection lawfully effective at the present time less the amount of \$15 heretofore paid by the complainant to the Suburban Water Company for service connection to supply the premises aforesaid.

ORDER No. 4422.

In the Matter of
 The Application of TOWSON AND CEDAR-
 CROFT BUS COMPANY for a Permit to
 Operate a Motor Vehicle for Public
 Use.

Before the
 Public Service Commission
 of Maryland.
 Case No. 1558.

WHEREAS, C. Robie Grafton, president of the Towson and Cedar-croft Bus Company, has this day filed a letter whereby he withdraws the above entitled application,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-third day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the withdrawal of said application be, and the same is hereby, permitted and that the case be entered as closed on the docket of this Commission.

ORDER No. 4424.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Petition of the RAILROADS OPERATING WITHIN THE STATE OF MARYLAND for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Changes in Rates on Petroleum and Petroleum Products, Carloads.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>S. N. & R. Docket.</p> <p>Case No. 540.</p>
---	---	---

The above mentioned petition, signed by B. Campbell, Chairman, Freight Traffic Committee, Eastern Territory, having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 24th day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, to all railroads operating in the State of Maryland upon whose behalf the aforesaid application is made, to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, tariffs amending the rates on petroleum and petroleum products, carloads, classified fifth class, to following basis:

Four and a half cents per 100 pounds higher than the rates in effect on May 25, 1918, not to exceed the present increased class rates under ratings as provided in Western, Southern and Official Classifications. The advance of 4½ cents per 100 pounds to apply to continuous through haul by publication of through or proportional rates to cover the movement from mid-continent fields to C. F. A. and Eastern Trunk Line Territories,

PROVIDED, Tariffs containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariffs shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4424 of date July 24, 1918."

OPINION

In the Matter of

The Application of THE BALTIMORE
COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COM-
PANY for Permission to Change and
Readjust Its Schedules of Quarterly
Minimum Charges or Rates on Metered
Water Supply Service.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 375.

Appearances:

ALBERT H. WEHR, President, for the Company;

CARVILLE D. BENSON, EDWARD H. BURKE and T. SCOTT OFFUTT,
for Protestants;OSBORNE I. YELLOTT, Assistant General Counsel, for the Commis-
sion and on behalf of the public.

By the Commission.

Filed July 25, 1918.

On July 6, 1917, this Commission passed its Order No. 3751 in the above case establishing the fair value of the property of The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company at \$2,010,564 as of December 31, 1916, and specifying 7 per cent. as the maximum return which it should be permitted to earn upon such valuation, if such rate of return could be earned through charges which were not in themselves, individually or collectively, in excess of the fair worth of the service to the consumer.

Printed copies of the above opinion and order were subsequently mailed to all the patrons of the Water Company at their addresses shown by its books. No protests were made at that time either against the valuation so made by this Commission or against its rulings as to the maximum permissible rate of return.

On November 20, 1917, the Water Company filed a new schedule of rates designed to yield a net return of approximately 7 per cent. upon the investment as it stood June 30, 1917, to wit: \$2,005,475.96, this sum being made up of the fair value of \$2,010,564 established by the Commission as of December 31, 1916, plus additions to plant at cost from that date to June 30, 1917, less proper deductions for the additional depreciation which the property had undergone between those dates.

The expenses of operation for the year ended June 30, 1917, had been \$123,722.46. To this sum was added \$140,383.31 (7 per cent. of \$2,005,475.96), making an aggregate of \$264,105.77 (reduced by certain deductions to \$263,317.85), which would have to be yielded by the new rates in order to insure the desired rate of return. This estimate was, of course, upon the assumption that the relation between the value of the property and operating expenses would remain constant during the period the proposed rates would continue in force.

The Company's rates in force on the date at which the above new schedule was filed were those prescribed by the Company's Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 1, effective November 1, 1910. Under that schedule the Company's property was divided into three service districts—the Western, embracing, generally speaking, its territory to the west of Baltimore City; the Northern, its territory to the north; and the Eastern, its territory to the east of Baltimore City. The Western and Northern Districts were and now are supplied from the Patapsco River plant of the Company at Avalon, and the Eastern District from the Company's Herring Run plant near the Philadelphia Turnpike northeast of Highlandtown. The service in the Northern District differs from the service in the Western in that while the water for both is pumped from the Patapsco River, that supplied to the Northern District has to be pumped a second time from the Company's repumping station at Catonsville into and through the Northern District territory. In the Eastern District the water is collected at Herring Run and distributed at a comparatively low cost to the Company's patrons throughout that territory. The resulting differences in the cost of pumping coupled with the relatively greater cost of distribution lines in the comparatively sparsely settled Northern and Western Districts than in the thickly settled Eastern District, with other circumstances bearing upon the relative cost of service, evidently seemed to the Company to have justified the making of different rates in each of these three districts. Consequently the rates for metered water had been fixed at 45 cents per 1,000 cubic feet (i. e., 6 cents per 1,000 gallons) in the Eastern District; \$1.12½ per 1,000 cubic feet (15 cents per 1,000 gallons) in the Western; and \$1.50 per 1,000 cubic feet (20 cents per 1,000 gallons) in the Northern.

In all three districts there were established certain quarterly minimum charges for water served through meters of different sizes, to wit: \$2.50 for a ½-inch meter, \$3.75 for a ¾-inch meter, \$5.50 for a 1-inch meter, \$9 for a 1½-inch meter, etc. In each instance these minimum charges entitled the patrons to the number of cubic feet of water paid for by that charge at the rate obtaining in the particular district. For instance, the \$2.50 minimum charge in the Eastern District would pay for 5,555 cubic feet of water at 45 cents per 1,000, while in the Western District the same \$2.50 minimum charge would pay for but 2,222 cubic feet at \$1.12½ per 1,000 cubic feet, and in the Northern for but 1,666 cubic feet at \$1.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. In addition to these minimum charges for the water service proper there was a further charge for meter rental, to wit: for a ½-inch meter 25 cents per quarter, for a ¾-inch meter 38 cents, for a 1-inch meter 50 cents, for a 1½-inch meter \$1 and for a 2-inch meter \$1.50.

The resulting aggregate minimum rate plus meter rental had to be paid by the customer regardless of the amount of water actually consumed, if within the allowance for the charge in that district, and for all water consumed in excess of that allowance a charge was made at the meter rate prevailing in that district. For instance a customer

with a $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch meter in the Northern District, whose house was vacant for an entire quarter and who consequently consumed no water at all, would have been obliged to pay a water bill of \$2.75, made up of the minimum quarterly charge of \$2.50 plus the meter rental of 25 cents. If a customer consumed 100 cubic feet in a quarter and his neighbor consumed 1,500 cubic feet, each would pay the same amount, \$2.75, this charge remaining constant at all consumptions between 0, and 1,666 cubic feet during the quarter.

In all the districts the size of the meter which a customer was obliged to take was determined by the size of the house and frontage of the lot. Thus if a seven-room house were on a lot of less than 100 feet front, a $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch meter was installed, but if the lot were more than 100 feet front, the same house would require a $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch meter. Under the rating table prescribed by said Schedule (the old rate) a seven-room house on a 101-foot lot would require the same size meter as a ten-room house on a 99-foot lot, and a ten-room house on a 101-foot lot the same as a fourteen-room house on a 99-foot lot.

These more or less arbitrary classifications of premises, and the theory of the schedule in general, had been the cause of a large number of complaints to the Commission since it had been in existence. For instance the customer who lived in a small house on a large lot complained that his water bill was the same as that of his neighbor who lived in a large house on a small lot, while the customer who lived in a small house on a larger lot complained because he had to pay more than his neighbor who had a house of the same size on a smaller lot. Again, the customer who had a small family and used very little water complained because his bill was the same as that of his neighbor who had a large family and used six or eight times as much water. A very general complaint against this schedule was from those whose houses were vacant at times, or who, because of their economy in the use of water, or the small size of their families, used far less than their quarterly allowance, and consequently objected to the minimum charge on the ground that it required them to pay for water they did not use.

The Company's new Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3 filed November 20, 1917, while based upon the same general principle as the old schedule, undertook to meet the objection so frequently made that it was unfair to base a water charge on the size of the house, and eliminated this objection by adopting lot frontage as the sole test of the size of meter to be required, specifying a $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch meter for a house on a lot not in excess of 25-foot front, a $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch meter if the frontage of the lot were in excess of 25 feet but not in excess of 100 feet, and a 1-inch meter if the frontage were in excess of 100 feet. It also abolished the differences between the rates in the Western and Northern Districts respectively, largely on the ground that the cost of the service in the two districts was approximately the same, and consolidated the two under the name of the Avalon District.

Another change was that abolishing the meter rental charge above referred to. Early in the history of this Commission the making of a

meter rental charge was quite common on the part of water companies throughout the State. The objections to this plan were so frequent and seemed so sound that the Commission abolished the system by its rules, the meter cost being capitalized and the meter maintenance costs being absorbed in the rates. The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company consequently abolished the meter rental charge in its new schedule.

But the principal change in the new schedule of rates was that increasing the charge for water itself, this increase being predicated upon the assumption on the part of the Company that it was entitled to raise through the new rates a sum which would yield a 7 per cent. net return upon the fair value of its investment in the public service.

In the Eastern District the charge was increased from 45 cents per 1,000 cubic feet to 60 cents, subject to a 10 per cent. discount for prompt payment of bills, or net 54 cents, an increase of 9 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. The former quarterly minimum charge of \$2.75 in the case of a ½-inch meter was lowered to \$2.70, but in turn the allowance of 5,555 cubic feet was reduced to 5,000 cubic feet. The base rate of 60 cents gross was also subject to a sliding-scale reduction for larger consumption, to wit: 60 cents per 1,000 for the first 5,000 cubic feet, 45 cents per 1,000 for the next 45,000 cubic feet, and 30 cents per 1,000 for all over 50,000 cubic feet, making 54, 40½ and 27 cents net respectively.

In the Avalon District, where the base rate had previously been \$1.12½ per 1,000 cubic feet in the Western District and \$1.50 in the Northern under the old rates, the gross charge for water was made \$3 per 1,000 cubic feet for the first 5,000 cubic feet, \$2.25 per 1,000 for the next 45,000 cubic feet, and \$1.50 per 1,000 for all over 50,000 cubic feet, or \$2.70, \$2.02½ and \$1.35 respectively. The quarterly minimum charge (net) in this district was made \$4.05 in the case of the ½-inch meter, \$6.75 in the case of the ¾-inch meter, \$13.50 in the case of the 1-inch meter, \$27 in the case of the 1½-inch meter and \$36 in the case of the 2-inch meter. In addition the quarterly allowance of water was reduced in the case of the smaller size meters and increased in the case of the larger sizes.

The rates in the Western District having previously been lower than those in the Northern District, and the two districts having been consolidated and given the same rates under the new schedules, it followed that the proportionate increases in the Western were greater than those in the Northern.

The comparisons between the old and the new rates can best be shown in tabular form.

TABLE I			
BASE RATE (Net)			<i>Per Cent.</i>
	<i>Old</i>	<i>New</i>	<i>Increase</i>
Western District.....	\$1.12½	\$2.70	140.00
Northern “ 	1.50	2.70	80.00

QUARTERLY ALLOWANCE (Cubic Feet)

			<i>Old</i>		<i>New</i>
			<i>Western</i>	<i>Northern</i>	
1/2	inch meter	2,222	1,666	1,500
3/4	"	"	3,333	2,500	2,500
1	"	"	4,888	3,666	5,000
1 1/2	"	"	8,000	6,000	11,666
2	"	"	11,111	8,333	16,111

QUARTERLY MINIMUM CHARGE

			<i>Old</i>	<i>New</i>	<i>Per Cent. Increase</i>
1/2	inch meter	\$2.75	\$4.05	47.27
3/4	"	"	4.13	6.75	63.44
1	"	"	6.00	13.50	125.00
1 1/2	"	"	10.00	27.00	170.00
2	"	"	14.00	36.00	157.14

ILLUSTRATIVE TOTAL CHARGES

1/2-Inch Meter

<i>Cubic feet per quarter</i>	<i>Old</i>		<i>New</i>
	<i>Western</i>	<i>Northern</i>	
1,000.....	\$2.75	\$2.75	\$4.05
5,000.....	5.88	7.75	13.50
10,000.....	11.50	15.25	23.63
50,000.....	56.50	75.25	104.63

3/4-Inch Meter

1,000.....	\$4.13	\$4.13	\$6.75
5,000.....	6.00	7.88	13.50
10,000.....	11.63	15.38	23.63
50,000.....	56.63	75.38	104.63

Almost immediately upon the filing of the Company's new schedule protests began to be made against the great increases in rates prescribed therein.

The principal grounds of these objections, and they are largely the same objections which have since been urged at the hearing, were that the proposed new rates were grossly excessive in themselves and resulted in charges far greater than the worth of the service to the consumer, that the front foot basis for the size of meter required was illogical and unreasonable, that the rates would result in gross discrimination among individuals and different classes of consumers, and that in general the quarterly allowances were far in excess of the rea-

sonable requirements of the patrons of the Company, and would result in many of them being required to pay at high rates for water they did not use.

On February 12, 1918, Edmund L. McCaffray and others individually and as constituting a Committee of the Confederated Civic Association filed a formal petition alleging that this Commission's previous valuation of the Water Company's property was erroneous and excessive, and, having been made the basis of the new rates proposed by the Company, was prejudicial to the members of the complainant Federation and to the public generally. They therefore prayed that a rehearing be granted them upon such valuation.

A copy of this petition was served upon the Water Company, which filed its answer stating in substance that if any mistake had in fact been made in the valuation of its property by this Commission, it desired the same to be corrected, suggesting that, under the Public Service Commission Law, this could be done at the hearing on its proposed new rate schedules.

A copy of this answer was served upon counsel for the petitioners who replied in effect that they were not satisfied therewith and desired to be heard upon said petition for a rehearing.

Accordingly the petition was set for hearing on the 30th day of April, 1918. In the course of such hearing the Commission, through its Chairman, suggested that the pro-testants employ a competent engineer to go over the appraisal of its Chief Engineer as embodied in the order of the Commission, and stated that if, upon such review of the valuation proceedings, any errors were found therein, the Commission would correct the same.

A few days after this hearing Messrs. Nicholas S. Hill, Jr., and John H. Gregory, consulting engineers, of New York City, were employed with the acquiescence and upon the recommendation of the Assistant General Counsel and counsel for the Confederated Civic Association to review the valuation proceedings previously had and make a joint report as to the substantial fairness or unfairness of the same, Mr. Hill to make a separate report embodying schedules of rates which, in his judgment, would be fair both to the Company and to the public.

On May 31, 1918, Messrs. Hill and Gregory filed their joint report upon the valuation of the Water Company's property as of June 30, 1914. In this report they stated that the unit prices used by the Company in its appraisal were, in general, fair and reasonable, errors therein having in great measure been corrected in the appraisal by the Commission's Engineer, and that there was no reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the "job cost" of \$1,557,961 ascertained by the latter and subsequently adopted by the Commission. In the case of the allowance of contractor's profit and expense the experts found that the Engineer's estimate of \$73,274 was too low and the Company's estimate of \$203,251 too high, the experts holding that the proper amount was \$116,742. On the other hand they found that both the

Company's estimate of \$433,601 and the Chief Engineer's estimate of \$354,367 for miscellaneous construction expenditures or construction overheads were too high, and that \$293,510 would be a proper estimate on this account. They further found that the Company's estimate of \$133,889 for accrued depreciation was too low, and that the Chief Engineer's estimate of \$182,710 would be fair and reasonable were it not for the fact that in the opinion of the experts the cost of the Herring Run development and the slow-sand filter plant at Avalon, less salvage, should be withdrawn from the active schedules and added to the estimate of accrued depreciation, the former on the ground that the supply is inadequate and subject to pollution and the latter on the ground that it is of doubtful value. The experts' estimate of the net deduction to be made on account of the Herring Run development was \$179,033 and on account of the Avalon slow-sand filter plant, \$23,171, thus increasing the estimate of accrued depreciation from \$182,710 to \$384,914. The experts stated that if the Commission concurred with them in these recommendations, "the rates should, in the absence of any evidence that the past revenues have been in excess of a fair return on the property, be sufficient to provide for the amortization of (the above) \$202,204 in ten years from the date on which the new schedules of rates are put into operation." They further stated in this connection that if their recommendations were carried out it would be necessary for the Company to finance a large additional capital outlay for the development of its new sources of supply on the Little Gunpowder River as well as to enlarge the present mechanical or rapid-sand filter plant at Avalon, and that the capital outlay for these improvements should be ascertained and added to the present fair value of the property as the basis for rates to be charged in the future, the Commission to specify by its order the time within which such improvements should be completed. Mr. Hill, when on the witness stand, testified that if, because of the war, or for any other reason, the Commission concluded that the abandonment of the Herring Run development and Avalon slow-sand filter would not be justified at the present time, their cost, less salvage, should not be retired from the active schedules as recommended, but should be continued in the base.

The experts, in their report, further stated that in their opinion the Commission's allowance of \$54,312 as the going value of the property could with propriety be increased to \$157,457, or 8 per cent. of the net cost of the physical property, as of June 30, 1914.

In conclusion the experts stated that while their method of approach in ascertaining the fair value of the property differed somewhat from that of the Company and the Commission's Chief Engineer, "the appraisal of the Commission's Engineer is fair," being \$1,810,398 as against the experts \$1,793,009 (after restoring the Herring Run development and Avalon slow-sand filter to the active schedules and excluding going value in both instances), a difference of but \$17,389, or less than 1 per cent.

The evidence subsequently adduced before the Commission showed

that the water from the Herring Run development is of a relatively high state of purity, well within the standards prescribed by the U. S. Government, and better than the water supply of Baltimore City. It further showed that the cost of the proposed Little Gunpowder River development under war conditions would approximate two million dollars, an expenditure which, in the opinion of the Commission, would not be justified at the present time under all the circumstances; that the Avalon slow-sand filter was efficient at the present time and that its retirement and replacement by an enlargement of the existing mechanical or rapid-sand filter at considerable cost would not be justified under existing circumstances. Moreover to retire these properties from the active schedules and amortize their cost, less salvage, over a period of ten years would, in the opinion of the Commission, result in imposing an additional charge upon the public through the rates which would not at all be justified in view of the increases which we find it necessary to make therein for the other reasons hereinafter set forth.

A recapitulation of the findings of the experts and comparison of the same with those of the Commission, both as of June 30, 1914, show the following results:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Commission</i>	<i>Experts</i>
(1) Job cost.....	\$1,557,961	\$1,557,961
(2) Contractors' profit and expense.	73,274	116,742
(3) Base costs, physical property..	\$1,631,235	\$1,674,703
(4) Total overheads.....	354,367	293,510
(5) Reproduction cost new.....	\$1,985,602	\$1,968,213
(6) Cost of franchises.....	7,506	7,506
(7) Total fixed assets.....	\$1,993,108	\$1,975,719
(8) Less depreciation.....	182,710	*182,710
(9) Net present value.....	\$1,810,398	\$1,793,009
Going value.....	54,312	157,457
Total.....	\$1,864,710	\$1,950,466
Working capital.....	37,500	37,500
Discount on funded debt.....	57,800	57,800
Total.....	\$1,960,010	\$2,045,766
Less customers' deposits.....	27,218	27,218
Fair value.....	\$1,932,792	\$2,018,548

* Herring Run development and Avalon slow-sand filter returned to active schedules.

On June 24, 1918, Mr. Hill filed with the Commission his "Report Upon the Incidence of the Rates of the Baltimore County Water & Electric Company," such report being a carefully prepared and thorough study of the entire rate question and covering some forty-two printed pages.

In this report Mr. Hill's method of approach was entirely different from that which had previously been adopted by the Company in the preparation of both its old and its new rates, and was designed to meet and overcome many of the chief objections made to the Company's proposed new rates.

The system of rates recommended by Mr. Hill was predicated upon the necessity of raising through the rates the sum of \$268,024, this sum being made up as follows:

Fair net return, 7 per cent. on \$2,005,475.96.....	\$140,383
Annual depreciation	28,486
Taxes	16,000
Operating expenses.....	85,263
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$270,132
Less miscellaneous receipts.....	2,108
<hr/>	
Sum to be raised through rates.....	\$268,024

This sum of \$268,024 was referred to by Mr. Hill in his report as the "Cost of service," and will be so referred to in this opinion.

He first subdivided this cost of service among the three districts, allocating the same for the reasons stated in his report as follows:

	<i>Per</i> <i>Cent.</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Eastern District.....	36.2	\$97,116
Northern "	40.0	107,591
Western "	23.8	63,317
<hr/>		<hr/>
Total.....	100.00	\$268,024

He next subdivided the total cost of service between fire service revenue and general water service revenue as follows:

	<i>Per Ct.</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Fire service revenue.....	6.7	\$18,098
General water service revenue.....	93.3	249,026
<hr/>		<hr/>
Total.....	100.00	\$268,024

As stated in his report, this allocation of \$18,098 to fire service did not represent the whole cost of the fire service, but for the reasons

given by him, he considered it a reasonably fair subdivision of cost under existing circumstances.

After deducting the \$18,098 allocated to fire service, there was left the \$249,926 allocated to general water service. This latter sum was next subdivided between what Mr. Hill termed "fixed service" charges and "proportional service" charges. Such "fixed service" charges or costs were defined by Mr. Hill in his report (page 4) as "the static costs which do not vary with the quantity of water produced," consisting of "the demand, capacity or readiness-to-serve cost, and the service or customer cost." It was Mr. Hill's idea that these costs should be paid by the customer whether he used any water or not, on the ground that the plant, property and service embraced by them had to be maintained or rendered by the Company for the benefit of the customer, subject at all times to his demand for water, and that it was but fair to the Company and its patrons generally that such customer should pay the same regardless of the amount of water actually used, and even though he used no water at all.

The "proportional service" costs were defined by Mr. Hill as "production or output costs, which are kinetic costs, and vary with the amount of production or output, or the amount of water consumed." It was his idea that these costs should be distributed among the Company's consumers in proportion to the amount of water actually consumed by them, subject to a sliding-scale rate varying with the amount of consumption.

His allocation of fixed service and proportional service charges was as follows:

	<i>Per Ct.</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Fixed service charges.....	40.0	\$99,840
Proportional service charges.....	60.0	150,086
Total.....	100.00	\$249,926

The above allocations of cost and consequent revenue to be derived were carried by Mr. Hill into his subdivisions between districts. In dealing with each district, Mr. Hill first set aside the amount to be paid for fire service. The balance of the cost of service to that district was then charged to all the consumers in that district. The 40 per cent. allocated to fixed service costs was then divided among the individual consumers, first by classes, depending upon the sizes of meters in use, and then by individuals in each class. The remaining 60 per cent. allocated to proportional service costs was then divided by the total water consumption of that district, and gave the average price per 100 cubic feet which would have to be paid for such water in order to raise the required sum. This average price was then split into a sliding-scale division as follows:

Domestic	First	40,000 cu. ft. per year
Commercial	Next	360,000 " " " "
Industrial	"	3,600,000 " " " "
Special	Over	4,000,000 " " " "

Incidentally it was necessary for Mr. Hill to make certain estimates and corrections on account of waste and leakage and the fact that the great bulk of domestic consumers in the Eastern District and a comparatively small number in the Western were using unmetered service and enjoying the benefit of flat rates therefor. He recommended in this connection that all consumers be placed on meter rates as soon as reasonably practicable. Meanwhile he suggested that the flat rates in the Eastern District, mentioned by the Company in its new schedule, P. S. C. Md. No. 3, be approved by the Commission.

In the case of fire hydrants Mr. Hill suggested that the required revenue be made up of a fixed service charge of \$9 per hydrant per year, and an additional charge of four-tenths of a cent or four mills per "inch-foot" of main pipe 6-inch and larger in the distribution system for fire service in all three districts. As explained by Mr. Hill in his report, the "inch-foot" plan of charging for fire service is intended to encourage the installation of a greater number of fire hydrants for the protection of the public at but little additional cost to the municipal authorities, since the charge is based upon the multiple of the feet of main and the diameter of the same in inches, over a certain size, and hence the greater the number of fire hydrants on a given length of main, the less will be the cost per hydrant, the aggregate inch foot charge remaining constant and the fixed service charge being the only variable.

Mr. Hill's recommendations as to the charges proper to be made in the several districts can best be shown in tabulated form:

TABLE II
EASTERN DISTRICT
FLAT RATES

House not over 13 ft. front.....	\$ 7.20 per year
" " " 14 " "	8.10 " "
" " " 15 " "	9.00 " "
" " " 16 " "	9.90 " "
" " " 17 " "	10.80 " "
" " " 18 " "	11.70 " "
" " " 19 " "	13.05 " "
" " " 22 " "	16.20 " "
" " " 25 " "	18.00 " "
Additional for hose attachment.....	4.50 " "

METER RATES

FIXED SERVICE OR CAPACITY CHARGE

Size of Meter	Charge	
	Per Year	Per Quarter
½ inch.....	\$ 4.00	\$ 1.00
¾ "	7.00	1.75
1 "	14.00	3.50
1½ "	36.00	9.00
2 "	48.00	12.00
(For larger size meters see printed Report, p. 25)		

PROPORTIONAL SERVICE CHARGE

Name of Class		Cu. Ft. Per Year	Cu. Ft. Per Quar.	Rate Per 1000 Cu. Ft.
Domestic	First	40,000	10,000	\$.60
Commercial	Next	360,000	90,000	.50
Industrial	"	3,600,000	900,000	.40
Special	Over	4,000,000	1,000,000	.30

FIRE HYDRANT RENTAL

Fixed service charge.....	\$ 9.00	per hydrant per year
Inch foot charge on basis of present number of fire hy- drants installed.....	37.00	" " " "
Total.....	\$46.00	" " " "

WESTERN DISTRICT

METER RATES

FIXED SERVICE OR CAPACITY CHARGE

Size of Meter	Charge	
	Per Year	Per Quarter
½ inch.....	\$ 7.00	\$ 1.75
¾ "	12.00	3.00
1 "	25.00	6.25
1½ "	63.00	15.75
2 "	84.00	21.00
(For larger size meters see printed Report, p. 25)		

PROPORTIONAL SERVICE CHARGE

<i>Name of Class</i>		<i>Cu. Ft. Per Year</i>	<i>Cu. Ft. Per Quar.</i>	<i>Rate Per 1000 Cu. Ft.</i>
Domestic	First	40,000	10,000	\$2.00
Commercial	Next	360,000	90,000	1.70
Industrial	"	3,600,000	900,000	1.40
Special	Over	4,000,000	1,000,000	1.00

FIRE HYDRANT RENTAL

Fixed service charge.....	\$ 9.00	per hydrant	per year		
Inch foot charge on basis of present number of fire hy- drants installed.....	26.00	"	"	"	"
<hr/>					
Total.....	\$35.00	"	"	"	"

NORTHERN DISTRICT

METER RATES

Fixed service and proportional charges same as in Western District.

FIRE HYDRANT RENTAL

Fixed service charge.....	\$ 9.00	per hydrant	per year		
Inch foot charge on basis of present number of fire hy- drants installed.....	40.14	"	"	"	"
<hr/>					
Total.....	\$49.14	"	"	"	"

At the hearing at which Mr. Hill testified, he was requested to submit to the Commission a plan for the determination of the size of meter to be required in any given case, so much objection having been made to the Company's plan of determining the size of meter by lot frontage rather than by a consideration of the amount of water actually consumed in the past or likely to be consumed in the future. Subsequently, and before the conclusion of the hearings, Mr. Hill submitted such plan, and the same met with the approval of certain of the counsel for protestants engaged in the hearing, with the exception of certain of his figures as to the amount of water to be consumed per quarter. These figures were modified by agreement of such counsel, and the plan as so modified is approved by the Commission. In substance it provides that each consumer may select the size of the meter which he desires, which shall not be changed, except at the consumer's request, unless the aggregate consumption in any two quarters within any one fiscal year shall exceed, on the respective meters, the following quantities of water per quarter:

$\frac{1}{2}$ inch meter.....	5,000 cu. ft.
$\frac{3}{4}$ " "	8,000 " "
1 " "	18,000 " "
$1\frac{1}{2}$ " "	45,000 " "
2 " "	60,000 " "
3 " " and larger, whenever a larger meter is re-	
quired to give satisfactory service.	

The following table based on the records of the Company for the quarter April 1, 1917, to June 30, 1917, which is a fairly typical quarter, shows the classification of customers by meter sizes as they actually were during that quarter, and also as they would be classified by the Hill plan as modified:

TABLE III

CONSUMERS BY CLASSES

BASED ON HILL RATING TABLE MODIFIED AS ABOVE STATED

EASTERN DISTRICT

<i>Meters Installed</i>			<i>Number of Meters reclassified as to sizes</i>					
<i>Old Schedules</i>	<i>Vacant</i>		$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$	2	3+
<i>Size</i>	<i>No. Premises</i>		<i>inch</i>	<i>inch</i>	<i>inch</i>	<i>inch</i>	<i>inch</i>	<i>inch</i>
$\frac{1}{2}$ inch	222	15	119	44	28	13	2	1
$\frac{3}{4}$ "	47	2	19	8	12	6	0	0
1 "	43	1	12	7	17	4	1	1
$1\frac{1}{2}$ "	13	0	2	0	3	6	0	2
2 "	37	0	7	3	2	9	0	16
Total	362	18	159	62	62	38	3	20

WESTERN DISTRICT

$\frac{1}{2}$ inch	338	8	327	2	0	1	0	0
$\frac{3}{4}$ "	367	14	340	9	3	1	0	0
1 "	168	4	139	12	7	4	2	0
$1\frac{1}{2}$ "	36	1	18	13	2	1	1	0
2 "	28	2	8	3	11	3	1	0
Total	937	29	832	39	23	10	4	0

NORTHERN DISTRICT

$\frac{1}{2}$ inch	1319	38	1261	13	7	0	0	0
$\frac{3}{4}$ "	1437	46	1361	19	10	1	0	0
1 "	282	7	242	22	9	2	0	0
$1\frac{1}{2}$ "	85	2	47	23	10	2	0	1
2 "	87	1	11	6	12	5	1	1
Total	3160	94	2922	83	48	10	1	2

From the above table it will be seen that under the Hill rating plan as modified, there will be a great many consumers who are at present on $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch and larger meters who will be entitled to be put on meters of smaller sizes, and who will thus get the benefit of the lower fixed service charges and at the same time have meters of ample size to insure adequate service.

This reclassification on the basis of the above typical quarter would stand as follows:

TABLE IV

RECLASSIFICATION OF CONSUMERS

<i>Class</i>	<i>Meter Required</i>		<i>Districts</i>		
	<i>(Hill)</i>		<i>Eastern</i>	<i>Western</i>	<i>Northern</i>
Vacant Premises			18	29	94
Not over 5,000 cu. ft.	$\frac{1}{2}$ inch		159	832	2922
" " 8,000 " "	$\frac{3}{4}$ "		62	39	83
" " 18,000 " "	1 "		62	23	48
" " 45,000 " "	$1\frac{1}{2}$ "		38	10	10
" " 60,000 " "	2 "		3	4	1
Over 60,000 " "	3+ "		20	0	2
Total,			362	937	3160

DIFFERENTIALS IN RATES

EASTERN DISTRICT

In some of the formal protests against the Water Company's new rates, and also at the hearings, considerable objection was raised to the differential in rates which has always existed in favor of the Company's patrons in the Eastern District and against its patrons in the Northern and Western Districts. This differential was increased by the Company's proposed new rates, which made the rates in general even lower in the Eastern District than they had been before. The Company's proposed differential in favor of the Eastern District was somewhat modified by Mr. Hill, who threw more of the burden of the cost of service upon the Company's patrons in that district. In addition both the Company and Mr. Hill proposed further differentials in favor of the Company's large commercial, industrial and special consumers, the most of whom are to be found in the Eastern District, by their sliding-scale plans based on the principle of wholesale consumption.

The prohibitions in the Public Service Commission Law against the making of discriminatory rates extend only to discriminations which are unjust and unreasonable, and the law itself expressly recognizes in terms the propriety of different rates among different classes of consumers.

As an abstract proposition, no rate which is in excess of the fair worth of the service to the consumer can be said to be a just or reasonable rate, but a literal application of this principle would require a different rate for each individual consumer based upon the peculiar needs of such individual and his relative ability to pay the same. Hence the necessity for subdividing the consumers into classes, and prescribing rates which will be fair and just to the average of the individuals in that class. From this it follows on the one hand that the classes adopted must not be too broad, because if they are, too many individuals will be found to be too far removed from the average, and on the other hand that the classes must not be too numerous, because if so, the result would be too great a multiplicity of rates for practical use. In short, the subdivision of the consumers into classes must be a reasonable one, based upon all the facts and circumstances of the case which directly bear upon the question of the fairness of the rates.

In the Eastern District the Company's plant investment is relatively small compared to the number of consumers. By reason of the proximity of the service district to the source of supply, and other advantages of location, the operating costs per consumer are less than in either of the other districts. Moreover the supply, purification and distribution systems in the Eastern District are entirely independent of and distinct from those of the other districts, and the only points at which the Eastern touches the other districts are those involving the general administration of the property as a whole. These facts amply justify the patrons of the Eastern District being regarded to a great extent as forming a class in themselves. We cannot, therefore, assent to the contention made by some of the counsel for the protestants that the rates should be uniform throughout the three districts. In the final arguments, counsel for the protestants who had made this point receded somewhat from this extreme contention, and asserted that the differential proposed by the Company in favor of its patrons of the Eastern District was too great. To this proposition we assent. In our opinion the rates in the Avalon District should be approximately double the rates in the Eastern District, but this proportion should not be materially exceeded.

WHOLESALE CONSUMERS

The differential in favor of large consumers embodied in Mr. Hill's report would seem to be in principle, at least, fair and just. It is a well recognized fact that, other things being equal, the cost of serving a large quantity of water to a single consumer in a given length of time is materially less than the cost of serving the same quantity of water to a large number of individual consumers in the same length of time. This principle is so well recognized and of such universal application not only in the case of public utilities, but in practically all

branches of ordinary commercial business as well, that it requires no argument in its support.

The sliding scale and resulting ratios suggested by Mr. Hill, when reduced to a quarterly basis, are as follows:

<i>Class</i>	<i>Cu. Ft. Per Quarter</i>		<i>Rate Ratios</i>
Domestic	First	10,000	1.00
Commercial	Next	90,000	.83
Industrial	"	900,000	.67
Special	Over	1,000,000	.50

The sliding scale and resulting rate ratios proposed by the Company in its new schedule, P. S. C. of Md. No. 3, were as follows:

<i>Cu. Ft. Per Quarter</i>		<i>Rate Ratios</i>
First	5,000	1.00
Next	45,000	.75
Over	50,000	.50

The effect of the Company's scale is to throw an undue proportion of the burden upon the small consumer and relieve the moderately large consumers embraced within Mr. Hill's Commercial and Industrial Classes of their fair share of such burden. We shall therefore approve by our order the classifications and ratios substantially as recommended by Mr. Hill.

THE RATES

Having reached the above conclusions, and having thereby determined that Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3 proposed by the Water Company is in the above material respects unjust and unreasonable, it becomes necessary for this Commission to prescribe a schedule of rates which, in the opinion of the Commission, will be just and reasonable.

It was generally conceded during the hearings and at the arguments of the case that the old rates of the Company (P. S. C. Md. No. 1) could, with propriety, be materially increased in many instances, but it was contended that the general plan or scheme of both the old and the proposed new rate schedules was bad, resulting, as that plan did, in the improper classification of many of the Company's individual patrons, and requiring them to pay for water which they could not reasonably be expected to consume. It was further conceded by practically all the counsel engaged in the case that the plan recommended by Mr. Hill was satisfactory in its general principles, although the specific rates recommended by him were objected to in general on the ground that they would yield a greater net revenue than the Company was fairly entitled to earn, and in particular on the ground that certain of the rates proposed by him were excessive as to certain classes of patrons.

DISCOUNTS

Under the former schedules of the Company, P. S. C. Md. No. 1, no provision was made for the allowance of discounts from the established rates for the prompt payment of bills except in the case of the Eastern District unmetered service where there was a 10 per cent. deduction on this account.

In its new schedules, P. S. C. Md. No. 3, the Water Company provided for a discount of 10 per cent. from the gross amount of bills for water supply service paid within one month after they became due and payable in the case of metered and public fire service, and within three months in the case of unmetered service in the Eastern District, the distinction arising from the fact that bills for metered service are rendered quarterly, at the close of each quarter, and for unmetered service annually, in advance. The rates provided that such discounts should be forfeited if the bills were not paid within the above respective periods.

The principle of allowing discounts from the published rates of certain classes of public utilities for the prompt payment of bills has frequently been recognized as sound, and would seem to be to the interest of the public as well as the utility, tending, as it does, to result in adequate service and economical operation.

Consequently the Commission approves these provisions of the Company's proposed schedules, and since the periods for payment are long enough to insure all patrons getting the benefit of the same, the net or discounted rate will be used throughout this opinion in our estimates of the amount which the rates prescribed by us may reasonably be expected to yield, unless otherwise indicated.

FIRE SERVICE RATES

The former rates of the Water Company for fire service were \$25 per year per hydrant, that being the rate agreed upon by the Company and the authorities of Baltimore City and Baltimore County, where such hydrants were located, as fairly representative of the worth of the service.

Table XXXIII on page 134 of the Company's brief shows that on June 30, 1917, there were 419 fire hydrants in service, other tables on page 188 showing the distribution thereof among the three districts and the amount of revenue derived therefrom, as follows:

<i>District</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Revenue</i>
Eastern	112	\$25.00	\$2,800.00
Northern	200	25.00	5,000.00
Western	107	25.00	2,675.00
Total	419		\$10,475.00

The same tables show the new rates proposed for fire hydrants in Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3, as follows:

<i>District</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Av. Net Price</i>	<i>Net Revenue</i>
Eastern	112	\$33.43	\$3,744.00
Northern	200	41.94	8,388.00
Western	107	41.34	4,423.50
Total	419		\$16,555.50

Mr. Hill's recommendation of a fixed cost plus the inch-foot charge basis yielded the following figures on the supposition that the installation of fire hydrants would not be increased:

<i>District</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Av. Price</i>	<i>Revenue</i>
Eastern	112	\$46.00	\$5,151.00
Northern	200	49.14	9,829.00
Western	107	35.00	3,745.00
Total	419	\$44.69	\$18,725.00

Table XXXIV in the Company's brief (insert app. p. 224) showed that Baltimore City's rate for the 17 public fire hydrants which it maintains outside the city limits is \$25 per year per hydrant.

In the Addenda to the Company's brief there are collected a large number of rates of private and municipal water works for fire and other service. On pages 122-5 a number of rulings of other commissions on the subject are referred to.

Mr. Hill in his report, pp. 7-8, states that the Company's theoretical apportionment to fire service is in his opinion too low and that there is no question that the total gross cost of service properly attributable to fire service is considerably in excess of the amount charged to that account through the rates proposed by the Company.

This Commission is of the opinion that the old fire service rates of the Company were too low, and if continued in force would result in imposing upon the Company's individual consumers a burden which they could not properly be made to bear. The revenue heretofore derived from the Company's public fire service under the old rates was \$10,475 during the year ended June 30, 1917. Under the Company's proposed rates this revenue would have been increased to \$16,555, an increase of approximately 58 per cent. Under the Hill rates it would have been increased to \$18,725, an increase of approximately 80 per cent.

During the course of the hearings evidence was adduced tending to prove the inadequacy of the Company's fire service supply in different parts of its territory. This evidence established to the satisfaction of the Commission that the service in certain portions of the Northern District is not all that it should be, although it is expected that it will

be improved with the completion of certain changes in lines and facilities now in progress.

In view of these facts and the further facts, (a) the proximity of the territory served to Baltimore City, (b) the \$25 rate charged by Baltimore City for fire hydrant service, (c) the fact that the rates previously charged were the outcome of bargaining between the Company and the municipal authorities, and may reasonably be accepted as their mutual conception of the fair worth of the service, and finally (d) the fact, as stated by Mr. Hill in his report, that fire service costs are largely fixed or static, and that the amount of water actually consumed through the same is comparatively negligible, this Commission has concluded that the fire hydrant service may properly be put on a flat basis of \$36 per hydrant per year, subject to a discount of 10 per cent. for payment of bills within thirty days, or \$32.40 net. Upon this basis, and upon the assumption that the same number of fire hydrants (419) will be continued in service, the above rates will yield \$13,575.60 per annum.

THE EASTERN DISTRICT

The Eastern District of the Water Company embraces the thickly settled territory immediately to the east of the present limits of Baltimore City, and entirely within the limits of the City, as extended by the Annexation Act of 1918, effective January 1, 1919.

This district embraces Canton and Highlandtown, the character of the development of which is closely akin to the development of the adjacent lands within the present limits of the City. For these and other reasons it would seem appropriate to give considerable weight to the rates for water now and for many years past charged by Baltimore City to its patrons. Under the City's methods of computing water service costs there are items of expense not considered, which must be given due consideration in estimating the cost to a privately owned water company, notably the item of return upon the investment, which under the City's plan is in substance and effect largely paid by the general taxpayer. For these reasons we would naturally expect to find the Water Company's charges higher in the Eastern District than are the City's charges within the City limits. As a matter of fact we find the flat rates proposed by the Water Company, except as to houses of 16 feet front and less, materially lower than the City's rates, and the Water Company's proposed meter rates decidedly lower than the City rates, especially in the case of larger consumers, the City's rate being a uniform one of 6.5 cents per 100 cubic feet and the Water Company's proposed rates 5.4 cents per 100 cubic feet for the first 5,000 cubic feet per quarter, 4.05 cents per 100 cubic feet for the next 45,000 cubic feet, and 2.7 cents per 100 cubic feet for all over 50,000 cubic feet per quarter.

The meter rates recommended by Mr. Hill for use in the Eastern District were in excess of those proposed by the Company, being, as

hereinbefore stated in another connection, 5 cents per 100 cubic feet for the first 10,000 cubic feet per quarter down to 3 cents per 100 cubic feet for all over 1,000,000 cubic feet per quarter, these charges being in addition to the fixed service charge of from \$1 to \$12 per quarter, varying with the size, on meters of from ½ inch to 2 inches.

Mr. Hill made no recommendation as to flat rates in the Eastern District beyond adopting the rates proposed by the Water Company for the purposes of his calculations.

In the opinion of the Commission the rates in the Eastern District should more nearly approximate, and in certain instances exceed, the charges made by Baltimore City for the same character of service.

We will therefore prescribe the following schedule of domestic flat rates for the Eastern or Herring Run District:

TABLE V
HERRING RUN DISTRICT
UNMETERED SERVICE

To private families in dwelling houses only, occupied by one family, for domestic use only, supplied with ¾-inch service connection, where the house occupies all or part of a lot of ground with

<i>Frontage</i>	<i>Rate Per Year</i>	
	<i>Gross</i>	<i>(Net)</i>
Not over 13 feet.....	\$6.00	\$5.40
“ “ 14 “	8.00	7.20
“ “ 15 “	9.00	8.10
“ “ 16 “	11.00	9.90
“ “ 17 “	14.00	12.60
“ “ 18 “	18.00	16.20
“ “ 19 “	20.00	18.00
“ “ 22 “	22.50	20.25
“ “ 25 “	25.00	22.50
Over 25 “	Meter required	

Rate for attachment for washing sidewalks or for limited use of hose \$5 per year (gross, \$4.50 net) in addition to the above rates.

At the conclusion of the year ended June 30, 1917, the Company had 5,730 unmetered customers in the Eastern District, classified as follows:

Not over 13 feet front.....	1926
“ “ 14 “ “	2796
“ “ 15 “ “	609
“ “ 16 “ “	246
“ “ 17 “ “	40
“ “ 18 “ “	55
“ “ 19 “ “	6
“ “ 22 “ “	24
“ “ 25 “ “	14
Over 25 “ “	14 (Meter required)

The amount actually derived from these consumers was \$32,459. Assuming the same number of customers of each class during the year beginning July 1, 1917, the revenue derived therefrom under the above rates prescribed by the Commission would be \$43,133, or an increase for this entire class of consumers of 32.9 per cent.

METERED SERVICE

In the case of the Company's metered consumers in the Eastern District, the records show that during the year ended June 30, 1917, the aggregate consumption as recorded by the meters was 120,590,350 cubic feet. At the Baltimore City uniform rate of 6.5 cents per 100 cubic feet, without allowance of any additional revenue derived from the minimum charges imposed by the City, the amount of water so delivered would have yielded the Water Company a revenue of \$78,384.

It now becomes necessary, pursuant to the views of the Commission hereinbefore expressed, to establish a set of sliding-scale rates subject to a 10 per cent discount for prompt payment, which may reasonably be expected to yield approximately the above sum.

Such a schedule of rates would be as follows:

TABLE VI

FIXED SERVICE CHARGES

						<i>Gross</i>	<i>Net</i>
$\frac{1}{2}$ inch Meter, per quarter.....						\$1.00	\$.90
$\frac{3}{4}$ " " " "						1.75	1.58
1	"	"	"	"	3.50	3.15
1 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	9.00	8.10
2	"	"	"	"	12.00	10.80
3	"	"	"	"	29.00	26.10
4	"	"	"	"	42.00	37.80
6	"	"	"	"	79.00	71.10
8	"	"	"	"	127.00	114.30

PROPORTIONAL OR CONSUMPTION CHARGES

				<i>Rate Per 100 Cu. Ft.</i>	
<i>Class</i>		<i>Cu. Ft. Per Quarter</i>		<i>Gross</i>	<i>Net</i>
Domestic consumption		First	10,000	10c.	9c.
Commercial	"	Next	90,000	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ c.	7.65c.
Industrial	"	"	900,000	7c.	6.3c.
Special	"	Over	1,000,000	5c.	4.5c.

During the year ended June 30, 1917, the Company's metered consumers in the Eastern District would have paid under the above rates as follows:

Class	Consumption	Rate		Bills	
	Cu. Ft.	Gross	Net	Gross	Net
Service charges.....				\$11,408.00	\$10,267.20
Domestic	8,218,215	10c.	9c.	8,218.22	7,396.40
Commercial	19,149,605	8½c.	7.65c.	16,277.16	14,649.44
Industrial	64,445,482	7c.	6.3c.	45,111.84	40,600.66
Special	28,777,048	5c.	4.5c.	14,388.52	12,949.67
Totals and averages	120,590,350	7.91c.	7.12c.	\$95,403.74	\$85,863.37

The difference between the above \$85,863.37 and the \$78,384 representing the aggregate consumption multiplied by the uniform City rate will probably be found in the revenue derived by the City from its minimum charges. The rates above enumerated seem reasonably representative of the worth of the service, and we will accordingly prescribe the same by our order.

Under the above rates the amounts to be derived from water service revenues in the Eastern District are as follows:

Fire service.....	\$3,628.80
Unmetered service.....	43,133.40
Metered	85,863.37
Total.....	\$132,625.57

AVALON DISTRICT

Pursuant to the views hereinbefore expressed, the Commission approves in general the rate scheme suggested by Mr. Hill in his report, with such modifications therein as were suggested and developed at the hearing and were assented to by some of the counsel for the protestants. Mr. Hill, in the course of his testimony, stated that his estimate of the revenue to be derived from service charges was based upon the assumption that all the meters as now installed would remain in service. A reference to Tables III and IV hereinbefore set forth clearly discloses that such will not be the case, under the rating plan subsequently submitted by him, as modified, and that under such plan by far the great majority of the meters ¾ inch and larger will be changed to ½ inch, based upon the consumption record, resulting in a corresponding reduction in the revenue thus produced through the service charges. By applying the Hill service charges for the Northern and Western Districts to the meter sizes as reclassified in Table IV, it will be seen that the gross revenue produced thereby amounts to over \$25,000 less than the revenue assumed by Mr. Hill in his report,

and if the discount rate of 10 per cent. is applied to these service charges, the net reduction will aggregate over \$29,000.

Some adjustment in these service charges should be made in order to overcome the great reduction in revenue to be produced thereby, as well as to make provision for the discount of 10 per cent. to be allowed for prompt payment.

The actual cost to the Company of rendering service in the Avalon District is something more than double the cost of rendering service in the Eastern District. Having established rates in the Eastern District which we consider fairly to represent the value of the service to the consumer, we will therefore prescribe rates for the Avalon District double those prescribed for the Eastern, to wit:

TABLE VII

FIXED SERVICE CHARGES

Quarterly Charge for	Rates Established by the Commission		Hill	For Comparison Eastern	
	Gross	Net		Gross	Net
½ inch meter.....	\$2.00	\$1.80	\$1.75	\$1.00	\$.90
¾ " "	3.50	3.15	3.00	1.75	1.58
1 " "	7.00	6.30	6.25	3.50	3.15
1½ " "	18.00	16.20	15.75	9.00	8.10
2 " "	24.00	21.60	21.00	12.00	10.80
3 " "	58.00	52.20	51.75	29.00	26.10
4 " "	84.00	75.60	73.50	42.00	37.80
6 " "	158.00	142.20	138.25	79.00	71.10
8 " "	254.00	228.60	222.25	127.00	114.30

PROPORTIONAL OR CONSUMPTION CHARGES

Class	Cu. Ft.		Rate Per 100 Cu. Ft.		
	Per Quarter		Gross	Net	Hill
Domestic Consumption	First	10,000	20c.	18c.	20c.
Commercial " "	Next	90,000	17c.	15.3c.	17c.
Industrial " "	"	900,000	14c.	12.6c.	14c.
Special " "	Over	1,000,000	10c.	9c.	10c.

During the year ended June 30, 1917, the Company's metered consumers in the Northern District and Western District would have paid under the above rates \$118,287.09 gross or \$106,458.38 net, in addition to which it is estimated that the 301 unmetered consumers in the Western District, if placed upon meters, would have consumed 30 per cent. of the water consumed by the 967 metered consumers in that district, the totals being shown in the following tabulation:

TABLE VIII

NORTHERN DISTRICT

Class	Consumption	Rate		Bills	
		Gross	Net	Gross	Net
Service charges,				\$29,910.00	\$26,919.00
Domestic consumption,	21,705,767	20c.	18c.	43,411.53	39,070.38
Commercial consumption,	2,603,863	17c.	15.3	4,426.57	3,983.91
Industrial consumption,	549,764	14c.	12.6	769.67	692.70
Special consumption,	10c.	9c.
Total,	24,859,394			\$78,517.77	\$70,665.99

WESTERN DISTRICT

Service charges,				\$11,060.00	\$9,954.00
Domestic consumption,	8,170,079	20c.	18c.	16,340.16	14,706.14
Commercial consumption,	2,803,834	17c.	15.3	4,766.52	4,289.87
Industrial consumption,	5,382,315	14c.	12.6	7,535.94	6,781.72
Special consumption,	67,400	10c.	9c.	67.40	60.66
Total,	16,423,628			\$39,769.32	\$35,798.39
Add for revenue from unmetered services,				11,930.80	10,737.72
Total,				\$51,700.12	\$46,530.11
Total for Avalon District,				\$130,217.89	\$117,196.10

These rates, as well as the uniform \$36 fire hydrant rate, will accordingly be prescribed by our order.

The amounts which would have been derived from water service revenues in the Avalon District under the above rates, on the basis of consumption during the year ended June 30, 1917, are as follows:

Fire service.....	\$9,946.80
Metered service.....	117,196.10
Total.....	\$127,142.90

SUMMARY

Summarizing the above figures as to probable yield of the rates prescribed, on the basis of consumption during the year ended June 30, 1917, we get the following totals:

District	Fire	Unmetered	Metered	Total
Eastern,	\$3,629	43,133	85,863	132,625
Avalon,	9,947	117,196	127,143
Total,	\$13,576	43,133	203,059	259,768

THE RETURN

The above estimates of the amounts which may reasonably be expected to be yielded by the rates specified are all based upon data as to the number of the Water Company's patrons and amount of water consumed during the year ended June 30, 1917.

But rates for service are to be prescribed for the future and not for the past. In order to ascertain the probable yield of such rates in the future, it becomes necessary to resort to estimates.

The Company's books show that its total water supply service revenue for the period of nine months ended March 31, 1918, was \$154,405.04. During the quarter beginning April 1, 1918, and ending June 30, 1918, the last quarter of the Company's fiscal year, the Company's new proposed rates were in force, and its books being kept on the accrual basis as required by the Commission's accounting regulations, it follows that no figures are available as to receipts for such last quarter on the basis of the old rates. It is therefore necessary to estimate the receipts for such quarter on an annual basis by adding 33 1/3 per cent. of the receipts for the first nine months to the above figure covering that period. Upon this basis the receipts for the entire year ended June 30, 1918, with the old rates in force would have been \$205,873.39.

We have seen that the actual water supply service revenues of the Company under the old rates for the year ended June 30, 1917, were \$196,063, and that on the basis of the rates hereinbefore prescribed by this Commission such revenues would have been \$259,768, an increase of 32.5 per cent., this increase being due entirely to the differences between the old and the new rates.

Applying the same percentage to the receipts for the year ended June 30, 1918, as above estimated, to wit: \$205,873.39, we find that the rates now prescribed by the Commission would have yielded \$273,977.

The books of the Company show its actual water supply service expenses for the year ended June 30, 1918, to have been \$151,290.57, made up as shown in the following tabulation, in which we have included the expenses for the year ended June 30, 1917, for purposes of comparison:

TABLE IX

	<i>June 30, 1918</i>	<i>June 30, 1917</i>
General	\$22,752.75	\$19,262.82
Operation	68,519.33	50,424.26
General Maintenance.....	10,805.54	9,410.62
Meter Maintenance.....	5,166.24	4,447.78
Gratuitous Work for Consumers....	288.60	67.95
Taxes	12,974.28	11,293.50
Depreciation	29,883.84	28,485.57
Total.....	\$150,390.58	\$123,392.50
Loss on Service Connection Work...	899.99	329.96
Total.....	\$151,290.57	\$123,722.46

From the above figures it would appear that if the rates herein prescribed had actually been in force throughout the entire year ended June 30, 1918, the Company's net income from its water supply service would have been \$122,686 during that year.

The Water Company had on June 30, 1918, 5 per cent. first mortgage bonds outstanding to the amount of \$896,000 and \$60,000 of notes, including a mortgage note for \$20,000. The interest on these bonds and notes accruing during the year amounted to \$46,426. In addition it had on its books June 30, 1918, an account for unamortized discount on funded debt amounting to \$55,632.50, the annual appropriations to which account are \$1,445. Deducting the aggregate of these amounts from the above distributable income would leave \$74,815 as the amount which could, in the discretion of the Company's directors, either be distributed to its stockholders in whole or in part, carried to its depreciation or other reserves, or carried to surplus. The Company's practice in the past has been to carry a considerable portion of its earnings to surplus and expend the same in additions to plant for the mutual benefit of the public and itself. Whether it will continue to follow this course in the future is a question for its directors to determine.

The above calculations bring us only to July 1, 1918. It would be desirable, if it were possible with any reasonable degree of certainty as to results, to carry these estimates at least into the fiscal year just entered and possibly into several years in the future.

But the effect of the new rates themselves upon probable consumption is in the first place a matter of some doubt, especially in view of the increases in the case of the Company's industrial consumers in the Herring Run District, some of whom may or may not resort to other sources of supply in view of such increases in the rates heretofore paid by them. In the case of the Company's smaller consumers in both the Herring Run and Avalon Districts, it is more than probable that the new plan embodied in the rates we are about to prescribe will result in their practicing greater economies in the use of water than heretofore when they come to realize that their bills for water service depend so largely upon the amount of water actually consumed. Therefore any estimates of probable receipts of the Company in the future under the new rates would be largely speculative.

But when we come to the other side of the account, and confront the task of estimating the probable expenses of the Company, even in the immediate future, we find that we are called upon to enter a realm of even greater speculation. With the prices of labor constantly soaring higher and higher, and the prices of materials of all kinds fluctuating almost daily, with a constant tendency toward an increase, it is obvious that any estimates upon this Commission's part as to the probable expenses of the Water Company even for the coming year would not be an exercise of judgment, but almost wholly a guess.

Therefore we must rest upon the assumption that the net income from those rates which will be yielded during the year beginning July 1, 1918, will be approximately the same as the net income which we

estimate would have been derived therefrom during the year which ended on that date.

This assumption may possibly prove erroneous, one way or the other, but the question is not whether the assumption is erroneous, but how far it is erroneous, and that question cannot be determined until after the new rates have had a fair trial.

Meanwhile the discount plan which we have adopted in formulating these rates will give this Commission an excellent opportunity to correct, in a simple way, any material injustices which may arise out of any errors in the above assumptions. The discount rate as established is 10 per cent. for prompt payment of bills. The Company will be required by our order to report to this Commission quarterly its receipts and expenditures during the preceding quarter, these reports to be made upon an accrual revenue and expense basis. Such reports will be subject to inspection by this Commission and by the public. If, at any time, it is found that the Company's net income is greater or less under the new rates than will constitute a fair return upon its property, as such fair return is hereinafter or shall hereafter be determined, a proper adjustment in the rate of discount will probably serve to correct the error.

This plan of rate-making is expressly authorized by Section 31½ of the Public Service Commission Law relating to gas and electric companies, and by the adoptive clauses of Section 42, to water companies.

This Commission has never heretofore adopted such plan, but the uncertainties as to probable receipts and expenses of the Water Company to which we have above referred would seem fully to justify its adoption in this particular case and at this particular time.

THE VALUATION

In this Commission's opinion and order filed July 6, 1917, in the valuation branch of this case we named 7 per cent. as the maximum return which the Water Company should be permitted to earn upon the fair value of its property used in the public service, qualifying this statement by the condition that such maximum rate of return would not be permitted unless it could be earned through charges otherwise reasonable to the public.

In this opinion we have specified schedules of rates and charges for various classes of service which we deem reasonable to the public independently of any question of their relation to the fair value of the Company's property.

It remains to be seen whether they are on the one hand inadequate, or on the other excessive, in the light of that value.

In a number of the protests against the rates proposed by the Company in its new schedule, P. S. C. Md. No. 3, and also throughout the hearings and in the arguments of counsel for the protestants, it was contended that under the circumstances of this case it would be improper to accept the engineer's estimates of the cost of reproducing a

portion of the Company's property less accrued depreciation as an index of the value of the property for rate-making purposes, some of the protestants and counsel contending that the proper measure of the value of the property would be its actual cost, others contending that the actual value of the property as shown by the Company's books of account should be accepted as the true value of the property, and still others contending that its real value was shown by the amount and market value of its outstanding stock and bonds.

All these values are materially less than the reproduction cost of the property less depreciation as found by the engineers and adopted by this Commission in its order of July 6, 1917, in the valuation proceedings.

It was also contended that the amount of \$2,010,564 determined by the Commission as the fair value of the property on December 31, 1916, by the above order, was erroneous and excessive, even under the reproduction cost theory upon which it was in part based.

The principles governing the determination of the fair value of the property of public utilities for rate-making purposes, as understood by this Commission, were discussed at great length in the opinion of the present Chairman of the Commission filed March 8, 1916, in the case entitled "In the Matter of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, Investigation of the Rates and Charges, Property and Affairs," Case No. 690, reported in 7 P. S. C. of Md. Reports, p. 143 *et seq.* In the determination of that case the Commission had the benefit of the testimony of expert witnesses of national reputation, and of the arguments of counsel who had specialized in this particular branch of the law for years. In view of the great length which this opinion has already reached, due in large part to what seems to us the desirability of setting out in detail the various problems which have confronted us in our determination of this case, it is unnecessary, in our opinion, to discuss again at length the legal questions here involved. We adhere to the conclusions of law reached in the Telephone Case so far as such principles or conclusions are here involved, and except in so far as the same are hereinafter modified.

In the Telephone Case the actual or original cost of a large part of the property in existence at the date of the inquiry was approximately ascertainable and was ascertained. The value of the property as so indicated was used by this Commission in reaching its conclusions as to the fair value of the property in its entirety. In the case now before us the actual or original cost of a great amount of the Water Company's property is absolutely unascertainable. The present property is made up in large part of independent properties formerly owned by the Chesapeake Electric and Water Company, construction begun in 1894, and the Catonsville Water Company, construction begun in 1886. The books and vouchers of these companies probably showed the actual cost of the property installed, but those books and vouchers were destroyed in the Baltimore fire of 1904. When the properties were consolidated in 1900, the stocks of the old companies were ex-

changed for the stock of the consolidated company with certain cash adjustments in the case of holders of stock of the Catonsville Water Company. The properties thus brought into the consolidation were thereupon placed upon the books of the consolidated company at the amounts which had been in effect so paid for them in stock and cash.

When, in response to the demand of counsel for the protestants that the actual or original cost of the present property be shown, an effort was made to show such cost historically, resulting in a figure but little lower than the fair value of the property as previously determined by this Commission, objection was made by counsel for the protestants to the results so obtained, on the ground that such historical cost started with the assumption that the properties of the former companies were worth in cash what had actually been paid for them not in cash, but in stock. This objection, in our opinion, is a sound one, and being sound, closes entirely the door toward any ascertainment whatever of the actual or original cost of the property in its entirety. But even though such actual or original cost of the property could be shown at this late date, it would by no means follow that such cost would represent the fair value of the property at this time. To that cost would have to be added any net appreciation of the property, or any of its parts, which might be found to have occurred between the date of its installation and the present time, and the result in the end would probably be, as it was in the Telephone Case, that the final figure arrived at upon this basis would closely approximate the figure arrived at upon the basis of reproduction cost.

Much the same difficulty is found when we attempt to use book values as an index of the fair value of the Company's property. The values now on the books of the Company started with the values placed upon the properties of the two constituent companies at the date of their consolidation. If those values are unreliable, as counsel for the protestants contend they are, then the book values would be to that extent unreliable.

The book value of the property on June 31, 1914, was, according to the figures furnished by the Company, \$1,442,549. Since that date there have been additions to the property, the net aggregate of which, after making deductions for depreciation since accrued, would have brought the book value up to \$1,653,378 as of June 30, 1918.

Were we to assume, as counsel for the protestants contend we should assume, that these book values are in excess of the actual cost of the property because the properties of the old companies were probably placed upon the books at figures in excess of their actual values, and alter the figures accordingly, which would be an act upon our part wholly without warrant of law, such book values would even then represent nothing more than the actual cost of the property, and could not be accepted as final evidence of its fair value for the purposes of this investigation.

That original or actual cost, and book values as evidence of that cost, should be given some weight in a rate-making case when estab-

lished as a fact has been held by many courts, but when actual cost is not established and becomes largely a matter of conjecture it would seem that it is entitled to very little weight indeed, if any.

It is interesting to note in this connection that in the case of the Havre de Grace and Perryville Bridge Company vs. The Public Service Commission, 103 Atl. p. 319, where the actual cost to the present owners of the bridge had been shown to the cent, and where its cost to the former owners had been shown with reasonable accuracy, the Court of Appeals of Maryland said:

"The original petitioners to the Commission seem to have proceeded on the theory that as the bridge cost the incorporators a very small sum, and as its receipts had been more than sufficient to defray the operating expenses, and repay the original outlay, that because it was a public highway, they were entitled to have the use of it for merely a nominal sum. The statement of so extreme a proposition is a sufficient refutation, and was so regarded by the Commission. * * * The Commission had determined naturally and properly to reject the valuation of the bridge simply upon the basis of what it had cost the incorporators. This would have been as far afield as it would have been to have taken the cost of the bridge to the P. W. & B. Railroad at the time of the original construction."

Other counsel for the protestants urged that the amount and market value of the Company's stock and bonds should be given controlling weight in determining the value of the Water Company's property. The outstanding bonds of the Company on June 30, 1918, were as hereinbefore stated, \$896,000, and the outstanding stock \$390,000, including \$90,000 of stock which had been issued in the form of a stock dividend. The evidence showed that some years ago several small blocks of the Company's stock, par value \$50, had sold for something less than \$30 per share, and that more recently a bid of 28 had been made, 33 asked. In view of this evidence it was contended that 30 would be a fair value for the stock and should be accepted as its market value. Upon this assumption the market value of the outstanding bonds and stock would not be in excess of \$1,130,000. It was accordingly contended that this sum represented the outside fair value of the property.

This contention ignores entirely the fact that in addition to the cash capital from outside sources represented by the Company's stocks and bonds, the evidence shows that for many years the stockholders of this Company went without dividends in order that the earnings from operation might be put back into plant, and that the Company sold certain of its properties at a sum over \$265,000 in excess of its cost as carried on the books, all of which money went directly back into plant. The contention also ignores entirely the going value of the property

which this Commission has found it to possess, and also in large part the items of borrowed money represented by outstanding notes, and the Company's present surplus, the addition of all of which would increase the value of the property on this basis to a point very little below the Commission's previous estimate of its fair value.

It is true that in the leading cases on the subject of rate-making it is stated that in the making of rates, and in arriving at the fair value of property used in the public service as an incident to the making of such rates, the original cost, reproduction cost and earning value of the property must all be considered, and that the rate-making tribunal shall also take into consideration the amount and market value of the utility's stock and bonds. Each of these considerations, it is declared, shall be given the weight to which it is fairly entitled under the circumstances of the particular case in hand.

But elsewhere in these cases it is stated equally clearly that where the fairness of proposed or existing rates is involved, the earning value of the property shall be given little, if any, weight in the ascertainment of the fair value of such property. Thus in the case of *Simpson vs. Shepard*, 230 U. S. 352 at 461, it was stated:

"The value of the use, as measured by return, cannot be made the criterion when the rate itself is in question. If the return, as formerly allowed, be taken as the basis, then the validity of the State's reduction would have to be tested by the very rates which the State denounced as exorbitant. And, if the return as permitted under the new rates be taken, then the State's action itself reduces the amount of value upon which the fairness of the return is to be computed."

And it was no doubt for the above and other reasons as well that the Court said elsewhere in said opinion (p. 440):

"Referring to the market value of the securities, the master said: 'Assets and property not devoted to public service have not been valued, and as they are a large element in stock valuation it follows that value of bonds and stocks is wholly unreliable and cannot be used in these cases as an element in determining the value of operating property or as a basis for rate-making.' In this view the master was undoubtedly right."

There are other reasons than those stated by the Supreme Court in the portion of the opinion just quoted why the market value of stocks and bonds should not be given controlling weight in determining the fair value of property for rate-making purposes. The market value of a corporation's stocks and bonds depends to a very large degree, at least, upon the earning value of the property and the earning value of the property depends directly upon the rates prescribed. If rates could be prescribed and upheld by the courts which would yield no

return to the stockholders and no interest for the bondholders, the market value of the stock would speedily go to zero, and of the bonds down to or below the investing public's conception of the value of the property under the hammer.

If, on the other hand, rates should be prescribed yielding a sum far in excess of a fair return upon the actual value of the property, those rates would inevitably be reflected in the market value of the utility's stocks and bonds.

Considerations of the earning value of the property of a public utility and of the market values of its stocks and bonds both have their places in rate-making inquiries, as we stated in our opinion in the Telephone Case, but both would be entirely out of place if made the final test of the fair value of the property involved in such a proceeding.

Largely for the reasons above stated this Commission in its opinion filed in this case July 6, 1917, declined to give the above considerations any controlling weight in arriving at its conclusion as to the fair value of the Water Company's property as of December 31, 1916.

The plan followed by the engineers in making their appraisals in that proceeding, and by the Commission in arriving at such valuation, was set forth at length in that opinion.

The Commission's justification for adopting the reproduction cost estimate in the main as the fair value of the property is to be found, if justification be needed, in numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, other Federal Courts, State Courts of highest resort, including the Court of Appeals of Maryland, lower State Courts, decisions of this Commission and public service and railroad commissions in other States, and practically all text-book writers on the subject.

In the comparatively early case of *San Diego Land Company vs. National City*, 174 U. S. 750, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that a public utility was entitled to "a fair return upon the reasonable value of the property *at the time it is being used for the public.*"

In the case of the *City of Knoxville vs. Knoxville Water Company*, 212 U. S. 1, the same Court recognized the propriety of using reproduction cost as the proper measure of ascertaining value for rate-making purposes.

On the same day that Court said in its opinion in the case of *Willcox vs. Consolidated Gas Company*, 212 U. S. 19 at 40:

"And we concur with the Court below in holding that the value of the property is to be determined as of the time when the inquiry is made regarding the rates. If the property, which legally enters into the consideration of the question of rates, has increased in value since it was acquired, the company is entitled to the benefit of such increase."

In the case of *Simpson vs. Shepard*, above referred to, 280 U. S. 352 at page 452, the same Court said:

"The cost-of-reproduction method is of service in ascertaining the present value of the plant, when it is reasonably applied and when the cost of reproducing the property may be ascertained with a proper degree of certainty. But it does not justify the acceptance of results which depend upon mere conjecture."

On page 454, the Court said:

"It is clear that in ascertaining the present value we are not limited to the consideration of the amount of the actual investment. If that has been reckless or improvident, losses may be sustained which the community does not underwrite. As the company may not be protected in its actual investment, if the value of its property be plainly less, so the making of a just return for the use of the property involves the recognition of its fair value if it be more than its cost. The property is held in private ownership and it is that property, and not the original cost of it, of which the owner may not be deprived without due process of law."

In the case of the *Havre de Grace and Perryville Bridge Company vs. Towers*, 103 Atl. 319 at 323, the Court of Appeals of Maryland said:

"The real point to be ascertained was not what it had cost either the railroad company to build the bridge or the incorporators of the bridge company to acquire it, but what was its fair value at the time of the investigation by the Commission. In a number of cases recourse has been had to this line of inquiry (reproduction cost) for a similar purpose, but the value testified to of such a structure is only one of the factors to which consideration must needs be given in such a proceeding, and the reproduction value is liable to be increased from other considerations, and diminished by various allowances."

In our original valuation of the Water Company's property the question was the fair value of the property in its entirety. Such property consisted of land, water rights, reservoirs, mains, pipes, pumping stations, stand pipes and other tangible physical property, and in addition thereto certain other elements of a non-tangible nature such as franchises and going value. The land and water rights were appraised at their market value. The other items of tangible property were appraised at the amount which it would cost to reproduce them, less allowances for the depreciation they had undergone in use. The franchises were appraised at their actual cost as provided by the

Public Service Commission Law. The allowance for going value was the Commission's estimate of the added worth which the property had as a going concern. To the resulting sum of the above was added the Commission's estimate of the amount of cash and other liquid assets which it would be necessary for the Company to keep on hand as working capital in order to render the public adequate service, this being less than the amount actually carried by the Company, and being property of the Company used in the public service just as much as any portion of its tangible assets. Inasmuch as the greater portion of the property consisted of physical property which had been appraised on the basis of reproduction cost, all the items were grouped, and the whole designated for convenience rather than for purposes of description, as the "reproduction cost" estimate, by which designation this summary was referred to in the opinion.

The Commission saw no reason why the reproduction cost value of the items estimated upon this basis should be reduced by any consideration other than that of its depreciation. Nor did it see any reason why the value so indicated should be enhanced. Those estimates were therefore accepted as the fair value of those portions of the property as of the date of the appraisal. There was no reason at that time either to increase or diminish the estimate of the market value of the land. It was therefore accepted as its fair value. The fair value of the franchises was fixed by law at their cost. The item of going value was fixed as above stated. The sum of these items was \$1,864,710. To this sum were added working capital and discount on funded debt, and from the total subtracted customers' deposits. The final figure was accepted as the fair value of the property as of June 30, 1914. The actual cost of subsequent additions to plant up to December 31, 1916, was accepted as the fair value of such additions with further deductions for depreciation, and there being no evidence of any other changes in the value of the property between those dates, the total was accepted as the fair value of the property on such latter date.

The property so valued belonged to the Water Company. It was all used and useful in the public service. Such being the case, this Commission would have had no right, even if it had been minded so to do, to deprive the Company of any portion of that property by arbitrarily placing a less value upon it than it had actually been found to possess.

If there had been found any special equities in the situation, on the side of the Company on the one hand, or on the side of the public on the other, those equities could have been adjusted in the rate of return which should be permitted the Company to earn under rates thereafter to be established, but those equities could not be used to diminish the actual value of the property itself. Such we understand to be the effect of the decision of the Court of Appeals of this State in the Havre de Grace Bridge Company case above referred to.

It is true that many courts in other jurisdictions have held that the fair value of the property of public utilities for rate-making purposes

is a special kind of value which may well differ from the value of such property when ascertained for other purposes. Other courts have held to the contrary. Still other courts have apparently been most unsettled upon the subject, and their decisions have been at one time in effect one way, and at other times, in effect, the other.

But the Court of Appeals of this State, in the Havre de Grace Bridge Company case, has decided this question flatly, when it said:

“Both in the argument and in the brief filed on behalf of the Public Service Commission, there was used, probably by inadvertence, an expression calculated to mislead—namely, the value of the property of the bridge company for rate-making purposes. The provision for the valuation of the property of a corporation, subject to the public service law, is found in the Code in Article 23, Section 442, where the Commission is empowered to ‘ascertain the fair value of property of any corporation subject to the provisions of this sub-title.’ That, and that only, is the valuation which the Public Service Commission is authorized to ascertain, and it would tend not only to work an injustice, but to render absurd a proposition that the property of a public service corporation might have one value in fact, another for purposes of rate-making, and a third for purposes of taxation, in the absence of statutory provision such as obtains in some States, that for taxation purposes property is to be assessed at only a given percentage of its real value. What the Commission in this case was authorized to ascertain under the section referred to was the fair value of the property.”

In the motion of our counsel for a new argument in the above case, the attention of our Court of Appeals was especially called to the authorities holding to the contrary of the above proposition. That motion was overruled, and the proposition thereby even more deliberately affirmed.

The decision in the above case involved an interpretation of a portion of the law under which this Commission was created, and therefore becomes the law as fully as though it had originally been written into the statute itself. By that law this Commission must be governed. And such being the law, the valuation of the properties of public utilities in this State for rate-making, sale and capitalization purposes is greatly simplified.

But it is contended that even assuming this Commission to have been right in accepting the reproduction cost value of a large portion of the physical property of the Water Company as conclusive evidence of its fair value, the Commission erred in its estimates of what that reproduction cost really was.

During the hearings in the present case, the Assistant General Counsel called the Commission's attention to the fact that our estimate of the fair value of the property as of June 30, 1914, contained an

allowance of \$57,800 for discount on funded debt. He contended that such allowance had been improperly made and filed a brief in support of his contention. The Commission is satisfied that such allowance was in error, and, without discussing the question, the deduction will be made.

The same error was found in part in the Chief Engineer's estimate of 4.25 per cent. for "preliminary and organization expense" and reduces this estimate from 4.25 per cent. to 2 per cent.

Other errors have been found in our previous valuation of the lands of the Water Company. Under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Simpson vs. Shepard, above referred to, the proper value to be placed upon land in a rate-making case is its present market value, regard being had to all its available uses and purposes, without the addition of overheads such as "engineering," "superintendence," "legal expenses," "contingencies" and "interest during construction," all of which had been computed by our Chief Engineer in accordance with established engineering practice and were allowed by the Commission in its former valuation. The Commission's present estimate of the fair value of the land upon the above basis is \$92,077, which is \$13,305 lower than our former estimate. The overheads computed upon the land value should also be deducted.

Messrs. Hill and Gregory, in their report on valuation, stated that the Commission's estimate of \$73,274 for contractors' profit and expense was inadequate, and should have been \$116,742. They also stated that in their opinion the Commission's estimate of \$54,312 for going value was inadequate and should have been \$157,457. The Commission adheres to its former estimates of these items, but would give the experts' recommendations upon these points more weight in case it should be found that over-estimates had been made by the Commission in other items than the above, since the experts' findings as to the value of the property in its entirety somewhat exceeded the Commission's valuation and it was not to be expected that they would coincide in estimating the value of each particular item going into the value of the property as a whole.

The above deductions from our former estimate of the fair value of the property are reflected in both the overhead and depreciation figures used in the former valuation proceedings, and the effect of the same upon the final total will be seen in the following tables:

TABLE X

<i>Items</i>		<i>Commission's Appraisal Per Cent.</i>	
(1)	Job cost of materials in plant, including cost of labor in erecting plant..	\$1,452,579	
(2)	Add contractor's profit and expense..	73,274	5.1
(3)	Base cost of physical property.....	\$1,525,853	
	Add land.....	92,077	
	Total.....	\$1,617,930	

Miscellaneous construction expenditures, including:

(a)	Allowance for errors, omissions and contingencies, 4.4% of (3).	\$71,724	*4.4
(b)	Engineering and supervision expense, 4.9% of (3) + (a)....	78,741	*5.2
(c)	Preliminary and organization expense, 2% of (3) + (a) + (b)	33,526	*2.2
(d)	Administrative, general, insurance and legal expense, 2% of (3) + (a) + (b).....	33,526	*2.2
(e)	Taxes during construction, 0.25% of (3) + (a) + (b).....	4,191	*0.3
(f)	Interest during construction, 4.5% of (3) + (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e).....	74,271	*4.9
<hr/>			
(4)	Total overheads added to (3).....	\$295,979	*19.9
(5)	Cost new of reproduction of physical plant (8) + (4).....	1,913,909	
(6)	Add cost of franchises.....	7,506	
<hr/>			
(7)	Total fixed assets.....	\$1,921,415	
(8)	Less depreciation, 9.1% of (7).....	174,848	
<hr/>			
(9)	Net present or depreciated value.....	\$1,746,567	
	Working capital.....	37,500	
<hr/>			
	Total.....	\$1,784,067	
	Less customers' deposits.....	27,218	
<hr/>			
(10)	Value as of June 30, 1914.....	\$1,756,849	

* Per Cent. of (3) Base Cost.

It will be noted in the above table that by the modifications which we have made in our former conclusions we have reduced our estimate of the aggregate construction overheads from 21.08 per cent. of the base cost of the physical property to 19.9 per cent. and their aggregate total to \$295,979 as against Hill and Gregory's aggregate total of \$293,510, represented by their percentage of 17.5 computed upon a different base figure.

CONSTRUCTION OVERHEADS

In our opinion in the Telephone Case we defined the term "construction overheads" as being "those costs which enter into the total cost of physical property in place, but which cannot satisfactorily be allocated or apportioned to the fixed capital accounts to which they properly relate," stating that they form just as much a part of the actual cost

of the physical property in place as do the items of material and labor, which can more readily be apportioned to each article of property as it goes in place. Construction overheads are in no sense, when so understood, arbitrary allowances for hypothetical expenditures, as seemed to be the idea of some of the counsel for the protestants. They are simply blanket estimates of costs which we know would be incurred in the reproduction of the property, and are made in blanket form, largely as a matter of engineering convenience. As a matter of fact some of these items of construction overheads in the case now before us were estimated upon individual items of property and subsequently set up at the resulting percentage which their aggregate bore to the entire base cost, this being done merely for the convenience of those making and handling the estimates of value.

Since June 30, 1914, the following additions have been made to the Company's plant:

ADDITIONS	
To December 31, 1916.....	\$149,320.14
“ June 30, 1917.....	14,916.37
“ “ “ 1918.....	96,862.14
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$261,098.65
Less net value of property sold.....	5,375.91
<hr/>	
Net additions.....	\$255,722.74

From the above are to be deducted appropriations to the depreciation reserves and addition to customers' deposits as follows:

	<i>Depreciation</i>	<i>Customers' Deposits</i>
To December 31, 1916.....	\$66,171.17	\$5,377.36
“ June 30, 1917.....	13,422.52	295.00
“ “ “ 1918.....	27,476.53	2,375.00
<hr/>		<hr/>
Total deduction.....	\$107,070.22	\$8,047.36

Consequently the total value of the property on the reproduction cost basis as of June 30, 1918, was as follows:

Value as of June 30, 1914.....	\$1,756,849.00
Additions to June 30, 1918.....	255,722.74
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$2,012,571.74
Less depreciation.....	\$107,070.22
“ customers' deposits.....	8,047.36
<hr/>	
	\$115,117.58
<hr/>	
Reproduction cost depreciated as of June 30, 1918	\$1,897,454.16

To the above should be added the Commission's allowance of \$54,312 for going value, making the total fair value of the property on June 30, 1918, \$1,951,766.16.

Had the above additions, with appropriate deductions for accruing depreciation, property sold and additional customers' deposits, been made to our former estimate of the fair value of the property as of June 30, 1916, a reduction of \$118,710.57 would have resulted in our estimate of the property's reproduction cost new less depreciation as of the present date.

GOING VALUE

The Commission's allowance for going value was \$54,312, being 2.7 per cent. of the estimated cost new of the physical property, while the experts' estimate was \$157,457 or 8 per cent. of estimated cost new.

The authorities are so unanimous in holding going value to be an element of actual value which must be duly regarded and allowed for in a rate-making case, that this Commission could not ignore such going value if it would. The propriety of its consideration has been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in the following purchase, taxation and rate cases:

Cleveland C. C. & St. L. R. Co. vs. Backers, 154 U. S. 439,
Adams Express Co. vs. Ohio, 166 U. S. 185,
Omaha vs. Omaha Water Co., 218 U. S. 180,
Cedar Rapids G. L. Co. vs. Cedar Rapids, 223 U. S. 655,
Des Moines Gas Co. vs. City of Des Moines, 238 U. S. 171.

The lower Federal Courts have also held it to be a proper allowance in the following, among other, rate-making and purchase cases:

National Water Works Co. vs. Kansas City, 62 Fed. 853,
Spring Valley Waterworks vs. San Francisco, 192 Fed. 168,
Cedar Rapids Gas Light Co. case, 118 Iowa, 234,
Des Moines Gas Co. cases, 192 Fed. 193; 199 Fed. 208, .
Shepard vs. N. P. R. Co., 134 Fed. 765, 810,
K. & P. Ry. Co. vs. Love, 177 Fed. 493, 496,
Ames vs. Union Pac. Ry. Co., 64 Fed. 165, 176, 178,
Veneer vs. Urbana Water Co., 174 Fed. 348.

The State Courts have also held it to be a proper element of value to be embraced in the valuation of property in rate-making and purchase cases. In the case of the Pioneer Telephone and Telegraph Company vs. Westernhaver (Okla.), 118 Pac., the Supreme Court of Oklahoma approved an allowance of 20 per cent. of reproduction cost as "going concern value" in the case of a telephone company, and in the case of Public Service Gas Co. vs. Public Utilities Commission, 87 Atl. 651, the Supreme Court of New Jersey affirmed an order of the

Public Utilities Commission of that State allowing 30 per cent. of the structural cost of a telephone company as going value.

Going value has been defined by this Commission (Telephone case, March 8, 1916, 7 P. S. C. Md. Rep. p. 143 at 194) as "that added value which enures to a plant as a going concern over and above the sum of the value of its component parts viewed independently of the whole." This value is sometimes sought to be measured by estimates of the cost of some of the things which are recognized as entering into that value—for instance, the cost of attaching customers or establishing or developing the existing business of the utility after the physical plant itself is constructed to the point of being able to render service. In other cases it is sought to be measured by the actual capitalization of the deficits from operation, actual or theoretical, during the earlier years of the enterprise when it could reasonably be assumed to have been operated at a loss. This Commission has uniformly declined to adopt the latter method of estimating going value as the sole measure of this value, holding that this method is of necessity both uncertain and largely speculative as well as, in some respects, unsound in principle.

The difficulty in connection with going value is not so much in determining whether or not it exists as in determining the proper measure of the same, and how it shall be considered in a rate-making case.

In the case of *Knoxville vs. Knoxville Water Company*, 212 U. S. 1, decided in 1909, the lower court had approved a specific allowance of \$60,000 for going value over and above the actual physical value of the property. The Supreme Court in its decision in this case "assumed without deciding" that this item was properly allowed in that form, reversing the lower court upon other grounds. In the opinion of the Court Mr. Justice Moody defined going value as "the added value of the plant as a whole over the sum of the values of its component parts, which is attached to it because it is in active and successful operation and earning a return."

In the *Willcox* case, 212 U. S. 19, 52, the same Court held that "good will" as that term is commonly understood cannot be capitalized against the public in a rate-making case.

In *Omaha vs. Omaha Water Company*, 218 U. S. 180, a purchase case decided in 1910, the Court expressly distinguished between good will and going value, and approved a separate allowance of \$562,712.45 for the "going value" of the property there involved.

The next case in order was *Cedar Rapids Gas Light Company vs. Cedar Rapids*, 223 U. S. 655, a rate case decided in 1912. In that case the Court below had declined to make a separate allowance for going value, but "expressly took into account the fact that the plant was in successful operation" (p. 669) and, to use the language of Mr. Justice Holmes in both instances, "fixed a value on the plant that considerably exceeded its cost," (670). The "cost" referred to was actual cost.

The next decision of the Supreme Court upon this subject was that in *Des Moines Gas Company vs. Des Moines*, 238 U. S. 153, a rate

case, decided June 14, 1915. In that case the master had originally added to his valuation of the physical property on the basis of reproduction cost the sum of \$300,000 as representing the added value which the property had as a going concern. His estimate of reproduction cost embraced the usual construction overheads. Evidently after his report was prepared, but before it was finally filed, the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cedar Rapids case was handed down, and the master modified his views by striking out his former separate allowance of \$300,000 for going value. When the case finally came before the Supreme Court the Gas Company's counsel contended that the master had erred in striking out this allowance of \$300,000 as the going value of the property and thereby, in effect, disallowing the same. In the opinion of the Supreme Court delivered in this case, Mr. Justice Day said:

"That there is an element of value in an assembled and established plant, doing business and earning money, over one not thus advanced, is self-evident. This element of value is a property right, and should be considered in determining the value of the property, upon which the owner has a right to make a fair return, when the same is privately owned although dedicated to public use. Each case must be controlled by its own circumstances, and the actual question here is: In view of the facts found, did the master sufficiently include this element in determining the value of the property of this company for rate-making purposes?"

After discussing the facts further and the cases on the subject the Court concluded:

"When, as here, a long-established and successful plant of this character is value for rate-making purposes, and the value of the property fixed as the master certifies, upon the basis of a plant in successful operation, and overhead charges have been allowed for the items and in the sums already stated, it cannot be said, in view of the facts in this case, that the element of going value has not been given the consideration it deserves, and the appellant's contention in this behalf is not sustained."

The next, and so far as we are advised the last, decision of the Supreme Court involving this question was in the case of *Denver vs. Denver Union Water Company*, decided March 4, 1918, U. S. S. Ct. Advance Opinions, No. 9, p. 305. In that case the rates of a water company were involved. The land and water rights were appraised at their present market value; estimates of the cost of reproducing the structures were made, and, from this cost, allowance for accrued depreciation was deducted so as to determine the reasonable value of the

structures in their present condition; and in estimating the cost of reproduction it was assumed that the work would be done under contract after fair competitive bidding, and with reasonable cost for engineering and superintendence in addition to the contract cost. An item of \$800,000 for "going concern" value was allowed by the master, as stated in the opinion of the Supreme Court, "upon the ground that the company had 'an assembled and established plant doing business and earning money' according to the principle laid down by this Court in *Des Moines Gas Company vs. Des Moines*, 238 U. S. 153." The master "did value the plant as capable of use and actually in use in the public service." The city and county of Denver contended that the separate allowance of \$800,000 as the going value of the property was an improper allowance, contending that while it was proper in sale cases to make such allowance separately, such course was not proper in a rate case. The Supreme Court said on this subject, Mr. Justice Pitney delivering the opinion:

"What we have said establishes the propriety of estimating complainant's property on the basis of present market values as to land, and reproduction cost, less depreciation, as to structures. That this method was fairly applied by the Special Master hardly is disputed by appellants, except as they contend the items allowed for 'going concern value' and for the water rights acquired by complainant and its predecessors by original appropriation. With respect to the former item, we adhere to what was said in *Des Moines Gas Company vs. Des Moines*, 238 U. S. 153; 'that there is an element of value in an assembled and established plant, doing business and earning money, over one not thus advanced, is self-evident. This element of value is a property right, and should be considered in determining the value of the property, upon which the owner has a right to make a fair return when the same is privately owned, although dedicated to public use.'

"As was then observed, each case must be controlled by its own circumstances. In the present case, the master expressly declared that his detailed valuation of the physical property and water rights included no increments because the property constituted an assembled and established plant, doing business and earning money; and a careful examination of his very elaborate report convinces us that this is true. The amount allowed by him on this account is not open to serious question from the standpoint of appellants."

In our former opinion in this case filed July 6, 1917, this Commission, through Commissioner Laird delivering the opinion, stated:

"Moreover, going value is reflected in the estimates of the engineers throughout their works, and must influence any finding of value by a commission. If this company were not

now a going concern, with all the responsibilities and all of the opportunities which that term implies, it would not be before this Commission for investigation, and the engineers would have to deal with only its scrap value."

The Commission thereupon estimated the additional going value of the property separately at 3 per cent. upon its depreciated value and included this amount, \$54,312, in its final figure representing the fair value of the property.

In discussing this subject, Commissioner Laird referred to the opinion of this Commission in the Telephone Case, which we have hereinbefore referred to, and stated that "the general conclusions reached in that opinion may be applied with justice and fairness to the present case." In that opinion this Commission made what seemed to it at the time a very clear distinction between that going value which enures to a plant by reason of the fact that its physical structure is a connected whole, and that other element of going value which enures to it by reason of the fact that the property constituted an established plant, doing business and earning money. The former element was taken into account in the engineer's appraisal of the property. The latter was taken into account in the Commission's estimate of \$54,312 as representing the added going value not embraced in the structural value. This allowance was 3 per cent. of structural value as compared with the 8 per cent. of structural value approved by the Supreme Court of the United States in the last case above referred to. This Commission's present decision is that the going value of the property here in question is the above \$54,312 plus any amount which may be included on account of such going value in our estimate of the structural value of the Company's physical property. Whether or not the above additional estimate of going value is added to the rating base, or value for rate-making purposes, is relatively immaterial under the circumstances of this case. The rates about to be prescribed by our order, and herein determined to be just and reasonable, will not be found, if our estimates are even approximately correct, to result in yielding a return to the Company in excess of what we consider a fair return upon either base.

SALES OF PORTIONS OF PLANT

In addition to the reasons urged by counsel for the protestants why the depreciated reproduction cost of the property should not be accepted as the fair value of the property for the purposes of rate-making, which reasons we have already discussed, counsel for the protestants further contended that the public should have the benefit of an alleged profit of \$200,907.08 claimed to have been derived by the Company from the sale of a portion of its water property to Baltimore City in 1905, and another sum of \$64,716.35 which the Company received from the sale of its electric property to the Consolidated Gas,

Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore in 1912, these respective sums representing the amounts received in excess of the values at which the properties had been carried on the books. Counsel for the protestants contended that these sums should be deducted from the actual value of the property in ascertaining its fair value as a basis for the making of rates.

This contention ignores not only the law of this State as laid down in the Havre de Grace Bridge Company case, above referred to, but also ignores certain essential facts which are, in the opinion of the Commission, equally conclusive. In the first place if the property which was sold belonged to the stockholders of the Company, then the money derived from its sale likewise belonged to the stockholders, and if the sale price embraced any profit, as that term is commonly understood, that profit likewise belonged to the stockholders and not to the public. While the property of a public utility is dedicated to the use of the public, and while by such dedication the public acquires an interest in the property, that interest exists only to the extent of and for the purposes of such use. The moment the use ceases, the rights of the public in the property, and necessarily in the proceeds derived from its sale, including profits, instantly cease. Meanwhile, during that use, and afterwards, when that use has ceased, the owner's rights in the property remain inviolable and are entitled to the protection of all the constitutional guaranties that surround the individual in the ownership of property. This latter principle has been recognized by all the courts and is clearly stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Smyth vs. Ames*, 169 U. S. 466, *Simpson vs. Shepard*, 230 U. S. 352, and in many other decisions of that Court.

Consequently the only possible ground upon which the public could with any reason whatever claim an interest in the proceeds of property which had previously been dedicated to the public use would be that such public had unlawfully been deprived of the use in such property to which they had become entitled by virtue of its dedication to their use. But in this case even that claim cannot be made. The sale of the property to Baltimore City was made by express authority of an act of the Legislature which authorized the city to acquire the properties of any water company within its limits. Having been made under such lawful authority it could not be said to have been unlawful. The sale of the electric property to the Consolidated Gas, Electric Light and Power Company was in turn made with the full authority of this Commission, which by law was authorized to grant such authority. Moreover in both instances the public use was not destroyed at all. It continued under the new owners as fully as it had existed under the former. Nor is there anything in this case to indicate that any of the present or future patrons of the Water Company were or may hereafter be in any way disadvantageously affected by a sale of a portion of the water property to Baltimore City as far back as 1905, or by the sale of the electric property in 1912. As a matter of fact the evidence tends to show that the plant today is not at all in excess

of the requirements of the public at present served. The rights of the public are to be measured by the value of the property at present used for their convenience, not by the value of property which was used for their convenience in the long distant past. And so, too, while it may be true, as so earnestly contended by counsel for the protestants, that the sale of a valuable portion of the water property back in 1905 may have disadvantageously affected the value of what then remained, such remaining property is not being valued as of 1905, but is being valued as of June 30, 1918. We must take the property as it now is, not as it might have been had such sales not been made.

RATE OF RETURN

In the decision of the Court of Appeals of Maryland in the Havre de Grace Bridge Company case to which we have above referred, Judge Stockbridge, delivering the opinion of that Court, said:

"No direct parallel can be drawn between a private corporation and a public service corporation, for the reason that to a greater or less extent the public has acquired an interest in the use of the property devoted to public use, and, correlatively, the company owes a duty to the public as well as to its stockholders, and must charge no more than a reasonable rate for the service rendered. In reaching this there are many factors to be considered. A partial enumeration of these would include the value of the property employed; the value of the service rendered to the user; whether or not the corporation enjoyed a monopoly; the rate of return which should be made to the stockholders, after the payment of operating expenses, upkeep and fixed charges; a reasonable allowance for depreciation; whether or not the utility is in operation or in fieri; the risk incurred by those who began the undertaking; and others which may arise out of the peculiar nature of the utility which is being operated."

In arriving at the schedules of rates which we deem proper to be charged by the Water Company until the further order of this Commission we have proceeded largely upon the theory that they should fairly represent the value of the service to the consumer, and have prescribed rates which we consider reasonable from that point of view.

It remains to be seen whether they are reasonable to the Water Company.

The rates prescribed are estimated to yield a net income of approximately \$122,000 during the year beginning July 1, 1918. Exactly how much they will in fact yield cannot be known until they are tried. Assuming the fair value of the property to have been approximately \$1,950,000 on that date, with going value included, such estimated earnings would yield a return of approximately 6.21 per cent. upon

the value of the investment. Assuming the fair value to have been approximately \$1,900,000, with going value excluded, such estimated earnings would yield a return of approximately 6.42 per cent. upon the value of the investment.

As was so well said by Mr. Hill in his report on the rates, in discussing a slight discrepancy in certain of his calculations, "The object is not to produce mathematical equations, but to distribute costs in a fair way."

And the problem before us in this case has not been to produce a schedule of rates which will beyond all peradventure yield to the dollar a specific sum in money which will bear a certain fixed and unalterable ratio to the value of the property used in the public service, but to prescribe rates which in themselves are in fact fair. Were we to succeed in fixing rates as of July 1, 1918, bearing a fixed ratio to the investment on that date, and the Company should on August 1, 1918, invest additional capital in plant for the use of the public, such a theory would immediately require this Commission to revise the rates. Such particularity in the making of rates was never contemplated by the statute which imposes upon this Commission the duty of prescribing rates which shall be just and reasonable. The most we can be expected to do, or could do in any event, is to establish rates which will be fair and reasonable, both to the Company and the public under all the circumstances of each particular case.

The law of this State contains no provision entitling the Company to a fixed rate of return upon its investment. It is entitled only to a fair return. In some jurisdiction returns as low as 2 per cent. have been held fair, in others as high as 20 per cent., the decision in each case depending upon the circumstances of that particular case.

In our former opinion in this case we designated 7 per cent. as a reasonable return to be earned by a water company as a general proposition, regard being had to the nature of the business, risks involved, etc., provided such return could be earned through charges to the public which were reasonable and fair. But we did not say in that case, as the Company in arranging its new schedules evidently assumed us to have said, that it would be entitled to earn a return of 7 per cent. upon the fair value of its investment in all events, and regardless of the reasonableness of the rates which would have to be charged in order to yield such return.

In arriving at our conclusions as to the reasonableness of the rates prescribed, we have taken into consideration all the contentions which have been made with respect to circumstances claimed to bear upon the fairness and reasonableness of such rates. Among other of such circumstances we have considered the Company's contentions that it will be necessary for it in the immediate future to make large capital expenditures in order to improve its service and make necessary extensions and betterments. Nor have we been unmindful of the recommendations of our experts that such probabilities should be taken into account in fixing the rates to be charged, in order that the Company

may be put in a position to secure the necessary outside capital to make such improvements. In our opinion the rates herein prescribed will in all probability yield the Company sufficient revenue for all its proper corporate requirements.

Nor would it seem that the rates prescribed are unreasonable in the light of the contention of protestants' counsel that they should be governed somewhat by the actual cost of the property to its present owners, or the amount and market value of the Company's stocks and bonds. If, to the estimates of such counsel as to what that actual cost really was, or to the market value of such stock and bonds, be added the profits which were put back into the property in the form of capital investments, together with the profits from the sales above referred to, similarly used, it does not clearly appear that even then the rates prescribed by this Commission would yield a return in excess of 7 or 8 per cent. upon the investment as so ascertained, and such rate of return would not be unreasonably excessive upon a basis so calculated.

THE RULES

The Company's Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3 filed November 20, 1917, contains a large number of rules bearing upon questions of service to its patrons, and the relative rights and obligations of each with respect to the water supply service. Some of these rules were discussed at length at the hearings, and the Commission directed its Chief Engineer and Rate Clerk to report at a later date a revision of the rules so filed. That report has not yet been made, owing to the fact that some of the rules would bear directly upon the question of rates, which were still to be prescribed by the Commission.

Not desiring to delay the final decision of this case, especially in view of the fact that the Company should have the revenue to be derived from its service for the quarter just past, and for which no bills have yet been sent out, this Commission will accordingly postpone its decision upon the rules until a later date. Upon receipt of the report of our Chief Engineer and Rate Clerk we will furnish copies of the revised rules to all counsel of record, and if they desire to be heard in connection therewith, such an opportunity will be given. The rules will then be embodied in a subsequent order.

Meanwhile an order will be passed prescribing the rates herein determined to be reasonable and such rules as are at this time necessary for a proper interpretation and application of the same.

ORDER No. 4425.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of THE BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY for Permission to Change and Readjust Its Schedules of Quarterly Minimum Charges or Rates on Metered Water Supply Service.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 375.</p>
--	---	--

In accordance with the opinion this day filed in the above entitled case, which is hereby made and intended to be taken as a part hereof, it is this 25th day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the rates and charges for service prescribed and set forth in Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3 of the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company filed with this Commission November 20, 1917, be and the same are hereby declared to be unjust, unreasonable and unjustly discriminating to the extent that they are in the case of any individual customer in excess of the rates and charges hereinafter prescribed.

2. That from the date of this order, and continuing thereafter until the 30th day of June, 1920, unless earlier modified or abrogated by the further order of this Commission, and subject to the regulations and rules hereinafter prescribed, and such modifications of or additions to the same as may hereafter be made by the lawful orders of this Commission, the said Baltimore County Water and Electric Company shall be permitted to charge its patrons in its Herring Run District, heretofore known and referred to as its Eastern District, rates and charges for water service not in excess of the following maximum rates and charges, which are hereby declared to be reasonable rates and charges for water services rendered by said Company in said Herring Run District, to wit:

HERRING RUN DISTRICT

UNMETERED SERVICE

To private families, in dwelling houses only, occupied by one family, for domestic use only, supplied with $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch service connection, where the house occupies all or part of a lot of ground with

Not over 13 feet front.....	\$6.00 per year
“ “ 14 “ “	8.00 “ “
“ “ 15 “ “	9.00 “ “
“ “ 16 “ “	11.00 “ “
“ “ 17 “ “	14.00 “ “
“ “ 18 “ “	18.00 “ “
“ “ 19 “ “	20.00 “ “
“ “ 22 “ “	22.50 “ “
“ “ 25 “ “	25.00 “ “
Over 25 “ “	Meter required.

Rate for attachment for washing sidewalks or for limited use of hose,
\$5.00 per year in addition to the above rates.

METERED SERVICE

Fixed Service Charges (based upon the size of meter required to
furnish the service for the given property), as follows:

1/2	inch meter.....	\$1.00 per quarter
3/4	" "	1.75 " "
1	" "	3.50 " "
1 1/2	" "	9.00 " "
2	" "	12.00 " "
3	" "	29.00 " "
4	" "	42.00 " "
6	" "	79.00 " "
8	" "	127.00 " "

PROPORTIONAL OR CONSUMPTION CHARGES

For domestic consumption,
(or first 10,000 cu. ft. per quarter) 10c. per 100 cu. ft.
For commercial consumption,
(or next 90,000 cu. ft. per quarter).... 8 1/2c. " " " "
For industrial consumption,
(or next 900,000 cu. ft. per quarter)... 7c. " " " "
For special consumption,
(or over 1,000,000 cu. ft. per quarter).. 5c. " " " "

SIZE OF METER REQUIRED

Consumer may select size of meter he desires installed, which shall
not be changed unless the aggregate consumption in any two quarters
of any one fiscal year shall exceed, on the respective meters, the fol-
lowing amounts per quarter:

1/2	inch meter.....	5,000 cu. ft.
3/4	" "	8,000 " "
1	" "	18,000 " "
1 1/2	" "	45,000 " "
2	" "	60,000 " "
3	" "	and larger, whenever such sizes of meters are required to give satisfactory service.

CHANGE IN METER SIZES

Whenever any meter is changed to another size at the consumer's request, or because the consumption has exceeded the above limits, the cost of such change shall be borne by the consumer.

PUBLIC FIRE HYDRANT SERVICE

The maximum charge or rate for public fire protection service, given only through fire hydrants installed on the public highways or private thoroughfares, at the instance of and under agreement with the public authorities, shall be Thirty-six dollars (\$36) per year for each fire hydrant installed.

PAYMENTS

Unmetered Service, payable annually in advance, within three months from the beginning of the year;

Metered Service, payable quarterly within one month after the close of the quarter;

Fire Hydrant Service, payable in equal quarterly installments within thirty days after the close of each quarterly period.

DISCOUNTS

All bills paid within the period specified above will be subject to a discount of 10 per cent. prior to October 1, 1918, and thereafter to any increased or diminished rate of discount which may be specified from time to time by order of the Public Service Commission.

DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS

All bills not paid within the respective periods specified above become delinquent at the end of the payment period, and thereafter are subject to an additional charge of one-half of one per cent. per month, or fraction thereof. The Company in such cases shall have the right to shut off and discontinue the supply after five days' notice in writing.

3. That from the date of this order, and continuing thereafter until the 30th day of June, 1920, unless earlier modified or abrogated by the further order of this Commission, and subject to the regulations and rules hereinafter prescribed, and such modifications of or additions to the same as may hereafter be made by the lawful orders of this Commission, the said Baltimore County Water and Electric Company shall be permitted to charge its patrons in its Avalon District, comprising the two water service districts heretofore known as the Western District and the Northern District respectively, rates and charges for

water service not in excess of the following maximum rates and charges, which are hereby declared to be reasonable rates and charges for water service rendered by said Company in said Avalon District, to wit:

AVALON DISTRICT

METERED SERVICE

Fixed Service Charges (based upon the size of meter required to furnish the service for the given property), as follows:

1/2	inch meter.....	\$2.00	per	quarter
3/4	" "	3.50	"	"
1	" "	7.00	"	"
1 1/2	" "	18.00	"	"
2	" "	24.00	"	"
3	" "	58.00	"	"
4	" "	84.00	"	"
6	" "	158.00	"	"
8	" "	254.00	"	"

PROPORTIONAL OR CONSUMPTION CHARGES

For domestic consumption,
 (or first 10,000 cu. ft. per quarter) 20c. per 100 cu. ft.
For commercial consumption,
 (or next 90,000 cu. ft. per quarter).... 17c. " " " "
For industrial consumption,
 (or next 900,000 cu. ft. per quarter)... 14c. " " " "
For special consumption,
 (or over 1,000,000 cu. ft. per quarter).. 10c. " " " "

SIZE OF METER REQUIRED

Consumer may select size of meter he desires installed, which shall not be changed unless the aggregate consumption in any two quarters of any one fiscal year shall exceed, on the respective meters, the following amounts per quarter:

1/2	inch meter.....	5,000	cu. ft.
3/4	" "	8,000	" "
1	" "	18,000	" "
1 1/2	" "	45,000	" "
2	" "	60,000	" "
3	" "	and larger, whenever such sizes are required to give satisfactory service.	

CHANGE IN METER SIZES

Whenever any meter is changed to another size at the consumer's request, or because the consumption has exceeded the above limits, the cost of such change shall be borne by the consumer.

PUBLIC FIRE HYDRANT SERVICE

The maximum charge or rate for public fire protection service, given only through fire hydrants installed on the public highways or private thoroughfares, at the instance of and under agreement with the public authorities, shall be Thirty-six dollars (\$36) per year for each fire hydrant installed.

PAYMENTS

Metered Service, payable quarterly within one month after the close of the quarter;

• *Fire Hydrant Service*, payable in equal quarterly installments within thirty days after the close of each quarterly period.

DISCOUNTS

All bills paid within the period specified above will be subject to a discount of 10 per cent. prior to October 1, 1918, and thereafter to any increased or diminished rate of discount which may be specified from time to time by order of the Public Service Commission.

DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS

All bills not paid within the respective periods specified above become delinquent at the end of the payment period, and thereafter are subject to an additional charge of one-half of one per cent. per month, or fraction thereof. The Company in such cases shall have the right to shut off and discontinue the supply after five days' notice in writing.

4. That for the periods aforesaid, said Water Company and its patrons shall be subject to the following regulations and rules:

REGULATIONS

When a customer desires to have a service pipe connected with the mains of the Water Company, he shall file an application with the Company on a form prepared for that purpose by the Company, setting forth the purposes for which he desires water, namely, whether for domestic, commercial, public or manufacturing use.

- (a) If the water is desired for domestic use, the application shall set forth the number of rooms in the house, the number of fixtures of each type, such as faucets, sinks, wash-tubs, bathtubs, urinals, toilets, etc. The customer shall also state in the application whether he desires a hose connection for sprinkling purposes or not.
- (b) If the water is desired for commercial or public use, the application shall set forth the number of fixtures as above noted, and in addition any service of a special nature, such as the service required for a local heating and lighting plant, for the operation of elevators, for private fire service, etc. If the service desired includes a heating and lighting plant, the customer shall state in his application the horsepower and type of boilers, the number of square feet of heating surface, and the size of engines in the plant. If the water is required for elevator service, the application shall give the number of elevators to be operated. If private fire service is desired, the application shall set forth the area of the floor space to be protected, the number of sprinkler heads to be used, and the number of hydrants to be installed. The customer shall set forth in his application the character of the business for which the water is desired, such as restaurant, hotel, boarding-house, barroom, store, school, depot, theater, etc. He shall also give as closely as possible the probable water requirements of the business.
- (c) If the water is desired for manufacturing use, the application shall set forth, in addition to the details noted above, the nature and character of the processes employed and which require special quantities of water. The application shall also give the customer's estimate of the quantity of water which he will require.

Upon receipt of this application, the Company will make a survey for the purpose of making its own estimate of the quantity of water which will probably be consumed. Based upon this survey the Company shall designate and recommend to the customer the size of meter to be installed:

- (a) For domestic, commercial, public and manufacturing use.
(b) For fire service.

If the customer accepts the estimate of the Company as to his or its probable water requirements and the meter and service pipe are installed as recommended by the Company, and after the meter has been in service one year it is found that the size recommended by the Company is in excess of that required for the service, the Company shall:

1. Return to the customer the difference in the fixed service charges collected from the customer during the time the meter had been in service, and the corresponding fixed service charges for a meter of a size and capacity commensurate with the service.
2. Replace the meter with one of proper capacity, at its own expense, or else leave the larger meter in service and bill the customer with the fixed service charge chargeable under the rates for the proper size of meter.

If the customer refuses to accept the size of meter designated by the Company and insists upon the installation of a smaller meter, and after the meter has been in service one year it is found that the capacity of the meter is too small for the service, as hereinafter specified, the Company shall:

1. Bill the customer for the difference in the fixed service charges collected from the customer during the time the meter had been in service, and the corresponding fixed service charge for a meter of a size and capacity commensurate with the service.
2. Replace the meter with one of proper capacity, at the customer's expense, and thereafter bill the customer with the fixed service charge chargeable under the rates for the proper size of meter.

RULES

Rule I. Separate meters shall be installed for fire service and for general water service, i. e., water used for domestic, commercial, public or manufacturing use. No meter installed on a fire service connection shall be used for the measurement of water for other purposes.

Rule II. The size of meter shall never be greater than the size of service pipe to which it is connected.

Rule III. The size of meter for fire service shall be the same as the size of service pipe recommended by the fire insurance companies to give the private fire service desired by the customer.

Rule IV. The size of meter for domestic, commercial, public or manufacturing consumption shall be based upon the quantity of water used by the customer during any two quarters of any one fiscal year of the Water Company.

Rule V. The size of the meter shall not be changed, except at the request of the customer, unless the aggregate consumption in any two quarters of any one fiscal year shall exceed, on the respective meters, the following amounts per quarter:

$\frac{1}{2}$	inch meter.....	5,000 cu. ft.
$\frac{3}{4}$	" "	8,000 " "
1	" "	18,000 " "
$1\frac{1}{2}$	" "	45,000 " "
2	" "	60,000 " "

Rule VI. In any case where the character of service is such that large quantities of water are used during a short period of time, placing undue or unusual strain upon the meter, the size of meter shall be determined from a test which records the consumption through the meter in question for a period of one week, or such other time as is mutually agreed to by the customer and the Company, or may be prescribed by the Public Service Commission. The maximum consumption so ascertained shall determine the proper size of meter to be installed.

Rule VII. If it is the desire of any customer to have a larger meter than that determined by the above rules, the Company shall install the same and bill the customer at the fixed service rate for the larger size of meter from the date of installation.

5. That beginning with the quarter ending September 30, 1918, and thereafter at quarterly intervals until the further order of this Commission, said Water Company shall submit to this Commission upon forms to be prepared by the Commission's Auditor, within thirty days after the expiration of such quarter, condensed reports showing all changes in its capital accounts, its operating receipts and expenses, and its net income from operating during the preceding quarter, with such other information as may reasonably be necessary to enable this Commission from time to time to determine the reasonableness of the rates and charges by this order prescribed. Said reports shall at all times be open to inspection by the public.

6. That Order No. 3751 of this Commission passed in this cause July 6, 1917, is hereby revoked.

7. That said Water Company is fairly entitled to earn during the period covered by this order, and until the further order of this Commission, the return upon its investment in the public service which will be yielded by the rates prescribed by this order.

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That a copy of this order and of the foregoing opinion of this Commission be served forthwith upon the said Baltimore County Water and Electric Company, and that within twenty days from the receipt of said copies said Company notify this Commission in writing whether the terms of this order are accepted and will be obeyed.

ORDER No. 4427

<p style="text-align: center;">· In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of the PENINSULA RAPID TRANSIT COMPANY for an Order Per- mitting and Approving the Discontinu- ance of the Operation of Its Motor Vehicle Service in Wicomico, Somerset and Worcester Counties, Maryland.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1567.</p>
--	---	---

This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4423 passed July 23, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding after due hearing that the exercise of the franchises of the applicant is no longer reasonably necessary or convenient for the public service, in view of the fact that the passenger bus lines of applicant have been operated at a considerable loss to the said applicant,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 26th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the applicant, the said Peninsula Rapid Transit Company, be and it is hereby authorized to abandon the franchises previously exercised by it and to cease doing business as a common carrier within the State of Maryland from and after 12 o'clock midnight of July 27, 1918.

ORDER No. 4428.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated April 13, 1918, with CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of One Pole Located on Private Property in the Rear of 3219 Carlisle Avenue, Three Feet East of the East Building Line of Hilton Street in the City of Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1569.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-sixth day of July, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4429.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY and THE HAGERSTOWN AND FREDERICK RAILWAY COMPANY for the Approval of an Agreement, Dated May 14, 1918, Providing for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Ninety-two Poles, Four Guy Poles, Four Pole Guys, Five Anchor Guys and Two Tree Guys Located in Districts Nos. 1 and 2, Frederick County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1570.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-sixth day of July, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4430.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of H. ROSS COPPAGE

vs.

CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND
POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.
Case No. 1566.

WHEREAS, It appears from the papers filed in this case, and particularly from the letter of George Washington Williams, Esq., counsel for Complainant, filed herein, on the date hereof, that the complaint has been satisfied,

It IS, THEREFORE, On this twenty-sixth day of July, in the year 1918,
by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That said complaint be entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4431.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of GEORGE S. KEMP		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
THE ARTESIAN WATER COMPANY		Case No. 1559.

The above cause having been previously set for hearing and having been heard on the date hereof, when both parties were represented in person or by counsel, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the complainant is not entitled to the relief for which he has prayed,

It IS, THEREFORE, This 29th day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4434.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Purchase of the Property of the MARYLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY and for Authority to Issue Additional Capital Stock in the Amount of Fourteen Million Four Hundred and Ninety Thousand Dollars (\$14,490,000) Par Value.		Public Service Commission
		of Maryland.
		Case No. 1564.

WHEREAS, The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and

approving the purchase of the property of the Maryland Telephone Company, and for authority to issue additional capital stock in the amount of \$14,490,000, par value, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on to be heard after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4410, dated July 18, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the purchase of the property of the Maryland Telephone Company by the applicant is necessary and convenient for the public service, and that the issue of said capital stock is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 31st day of July, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, (1) That the purchase by The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City of the property of the Maryland Telephone Company be and the same hereby is permitted and approved.

(2) That the issue by said The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City of its capital stock in the amount of \$14,490,000 par value for the acquisition of property, the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its plant or distributing service, the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations, and to cause the aggregate capitalization to conform to the fair value of the property of said The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City as established by this Commission in Case No. 690, is hereby authorized and approved, said stock to be used and applied in the manner and for the purposes set forth in the application herein, and schedule marked Exhibit "A," filed therewith.

(3) That said The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City shall make reports to this Commission, duly verified by affidavits, as follows:

(a) Upon the consummation of the transfer of the property of the Maryland Telephone Company to the said The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City, the fact of such transfer, together with copy of the deed effecting such transfer.

(b) Upon the issue of the stock, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue or issues and the purpose for which issued, until the total amount of capital stock by this order authorized to be issued shall have been issued and disposed of.

ORDER No. 4436.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
Electric Lighting Rate Schedule P. S. C.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
Md. No. 42 of THE HAGERSTOWN AND		
FREDERICK RAILWAY COMPANY.		

WHEREAS, Electric lighting rate schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 42 of The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company was filed with the Commission on May 25, 1918, to become effective June 25, 1918, the effect of which schedule is to considerably increase the rates charged for electric energy used for lighting purposes in the town of Hagerstown, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, Application has been made to this Commission by said The Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company for permission to withdraw the aforesaid schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 42 and to continue in effect the rates lawfully effective prior to June 25, 1918, until such time as said rates are changed in the manner provided by the Public Service Commission Law and the rules of the Commission, and

WHEREAS, After due consideration it appears to the Commission that said request is reasonable and proper, and should be granted,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company be and it is hereby permitted to withdraw the increased electric lighting rates contained in its schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 42, heretofore filed with the Commission to become effective on June 25, 1918, and to continue in force the rates and charges theretofore effective until such time as said rates and charges are lawfully changed.

ORDER No. 4437.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
Electric Lighting Rate Schedule P. S. C.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
Md. No. 6 of the HAGERSTOWN MU-		
NICIPAL ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT.		

WHEREAS, Electric lighting rate schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 6 of the Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant was filed with the Commission on May 25, 1918, to become effective June 25, 1918, the effect of which schedule is to considerably increase the rates charged for

electric energy used for lighting purposes in the town of Hagerstown, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, Application has been made to this Commission by said Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant for permission to withdraw the aforesaid schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 6, and to continue in effect the rates lawfully effective prior to June 25, 1918, until such time as said rates are changed in the manner provided by the Public Service Commission Law and the rules of the Commission, and

WHEREAS, After due consideration it appears to the Commission that said request is reasonable and proper, and should be granted,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant be and it is hereby permitted to withdraw the increased electric lighting rates contained in its schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 6, heretofore filed with the Commission to become effective on June 25, 1918, and to continue in force the rates and charges theretofore effective until such time as said rates and charges are lawfully changed.

ORDER No. 4438

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of HORACE T. SMITH		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE		Case No. 1475.

WHEREAS, This case, involving the adequacy of the service furnished by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore on the Garrison Boulevard Line of said company, to correct which alleged inadequacy of service this Commission is petitioned to order the respondent:

(a) To operate a much greater number of cars on the Garrison Boulevard Line.

(b) To run the cars according to a schedule which will keep them as near as possible equally spaced apart.

(c) To stop the cars and let on passengers when there is room in the cars for them.

(d) To maintain a shorter headway between cars.

(e) To treat all lines alike with respect to lighting.

(f) To operate either the Edmondson Avenue or one of the North Avenue lines along Garrison Avenue north of Walbrook Junction,

being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been made by the Commission, and

WHEREAS, It being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the service furnished by the respondent at the time the complaint was brought was in certain respects inadequate, in that cars on the line in question were not run in accordance with schedule, resulting in the bunching of cars and irregular service, and in that cars frequently failed to stop to let on passengers when there was room in such cars for additional passengers, and in that the lighting of cars on said line was at times inferior to the lighting service contemporaneously furnished on cars of other lines of the respondent, and

WHEREAS, It being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the service now being furnished by the respondent on its Garrison Boulevard Line is reasonably adequate, particularly in view of the difficulties resulting from war conditions now being encountered by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore in the operation of its system, the Commission being further of the opinion and finding that the service at present furnished on the line aforesaid is at least as adequate as the service furnished on other lines of the respondent, and that the conditions complained of for which relief is sought in paragraphs (b), (c) and (e) aforesaid do not longer exist, and that for the reasons aforesaid the relief prayed for in the other paragraphs is not now required,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4439.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of JOHN FAIT		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
THE GLENBURNIE LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY		Case No. 1458.

The above cause having been set for hearing and heard on the twenty-fifth day of January, 1918, when both parties were present or represented by counsel, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that the complainant is not entitled to the relief for which he prays,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This first day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4441.

In the Matter of

The Recommendation of UNITED STATES
FUEL ADMINISTRATION by P. B. Noyes,
Its Director of Conservation, and F. A.
Meyer, Fuel Administrator of This
State, That the "Stagger Stop" Be
Permitted and Put in Effect by The
United Railways and Electric Company
of Baltimore as a War Measure for
the Conservation of Fuel.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1506.

The petition of J. H. Branham, M. D., President of the Franklin Square Hospital, having been duly investigated by the Commission and its Transportation Expert having recommended the restoration of the stop covered by said petition and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore having filed herein on the 25th day of July, 1918, a letter waiving its right to a hearing, it is this first day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore forthwith restore the west bound stop on Fayette Street at Calhoun on the Gilmore Street Line of said Company;

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a copy of this Order be immediately served upon the proper representative of The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that said Company notify this Commission in writing within five days after the receipt of said copy whether or not it will accept and abide by this Order.

ORDER No. 4443.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the CARRIERS NOT UNDER FEDERAL CONTROL Named in the Official Classification by R. N. Collyer, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 541.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 5th day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, carriers not under Federal Control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their Agent, to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, departing from the provisions of this Commission's Circular No. 10-A in so far as number of effective supplements is concerned, amending Rule 29 respecting tank cars of private ownership as set forth in petition herein,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4443 of date August 5, 1918."

ORDER No. 4445.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of MICHAEL J. FITZSIMMONS

vs.

THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY OF BALTIMORE

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1516.

WHEREAS, This case, involving the reasonableness of the withdrawal by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore of the

extension of the Baltimore City fare heretofore voluntarily accorded Riverview Park, an excursion resort, of which the complainant is lessee, during certain hours of the day during the summer excursion season, being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had by the Commission, and

WHEREAS, It being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the increase in fare between Riverview Park and Baltimore points resulting from the withdrawal of the extension of the Baltimore City fare to Riverview Park has not had the effect of materially reducing the excursion traffic to said resort, which was the result originally intended to be effected by the withdrawal of the extension of the Baltimore City fare to Riverview Park, so as to enable the respondent to more adequately provide for and take care of the regular traffic on this and other lines of respondent, said regular traffic has been greatly increased owing to the large number of additional employees of munition plants, shipyards and other industries engaged in essential war work who must be daily transported to and from their places of employment by the respondent, and

WHEREAS, It being the further opinion and finding of the Commission that the increase in gross revenue of the respondent resulting from the aforesaid increase in fare is reasonable, and necessary in order to provide for the increased costs of operation now being encountered by the respondent, and that the aforesaid increase in the summer excursion fare between Baltimore and Riverview Park is neither unjust, unreasonable nor unjustly discriminatory,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 6th day of August, in the Year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be and it is hereby dismissed.

ORDER No. 4446.

In the Matter of
The Complaint of HARRY S. CARVER,
ET AL.,

vs.

BEL AIR ELECTRIC COMPANY

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1245.

WHEREAS, This case involving the adequacy of the service furnished by The Bel Air Electric Company, being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the par-

ties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had by the Commission, and

WHEREAS, It appears from the record that in accordance with recommendation of the Chief Engineer of the Commission the respondent has purchased and installed and now has in operation an auxiliary power plant to supplement its hydro-electric plant, and

WHEREAS, It being the opinion and finding of the Commission that while the service furnished by the respondent at the time the complaint was brought was inadequate, the service furnished since the installation of the auxiliary power plant aforesaid has been and is now reasonably adequate,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 6th day of August, in the Year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled case be and it is hereby entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4447.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE Under the Provisions of Order No. 1630 for Approval of Plans and Specifications of New Cars to Be Purchased by the Said Company.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1555.

Upon petition of The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and the exhibits filed therewith, and the joint report of the Chief Engineer and the Transportation Expert of this Commission filed herein,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 6th day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore be, and it is hereby, authorized to place in service cars constructed according to the specifications filed as exhibits with said petition, the same having been approved by the Commission.

ORDER No. 4448.

In the Matter of	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 843.
The Complaint of DANIEL M. HENDERSON		
vs.		
BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY		

The above cause having heretofore come on for hearing and the record therein by agreement of the parties in interest having been consolidated with and considered by the Commission in connection with Case No. 375 before this Commission, involving the rates, rules and regulations of the respondent company, and

WHEREAS, The Commission having filed its opinion and entered its order in Case No. 375 on July 25, 1918, thereby disposing of the matter of this complaint,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 6th day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be and the same is hereby dismissed.

ORDER No. 4449.

In the Matter of	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1451.
The Petition of DELMAR WATER COMPANY		
for Authority to Sell \$5,000 Par Value		
of Its First Mortgage Bonds Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 1075, Entered February 13, 1913, in Case No. 540.		

WHEREAS, The Delmar Water Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and authorized to do business in the State of Maryland as evidenced by certificate from the Secretary of State of Maryland filed in Case No. 458, and owning and operating a water plant in the town of Delmar, Wicomico County, Maryland, has applied to this Commission for authority to issue and sell its Twenty-Year Six Per Cent. First Mortgage Gold Bonds bearing date of January 1, 1913, of the aggregate principal amount of Five Thou-

sand Dollars (\$5,000), being part of a total authorized issue of Thirty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$35,000), of which bonds of the amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) have heretofore been issued and sold under authority of this Commission's Order No. 1075 entered on February 13, 1913, in Case No. 540, the proceeds from the sale of said bonds to be used for the purpose of refunding said company's obligations incurred in making betterments, improvements and additions to its plant and distributing system, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on January 15, 1918, after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4035 passed December 31, 1917, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after investigation that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue and sale of said bonds is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation, to wit: the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations incurred in making expenditures for proper corporate capital purposes,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 6th day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the issue and sale for cash at not less than ninety per centum of their face value by the Delmar Water Company of its Twenty-Year Six Per Cent. First Mortgage Gold Bonds of the aggregate principal amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) for the purposes in said application set forth be and the same is hereby authorized and approved.

2. That the said Delmar Water Company shall make reports to this Commission, duly verified by affidavits, upon the issue and sale of its bonds, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue and sale or sales, the terms and conditions thereof, the amount realized therefrom, and the obligations of said company refunded with the proceeds of the sale or sales of said bonds.

ORDER No. 4450.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of THE TRAPPE ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$5,000 Par Value of Its Capital Stock, Proceeds from the Sale Thereof to Be Used for the Purchase of Property and for Other Lawful Corporate Purposes.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1571.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, The Trappe Electric Light Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for authority to issue its capital stock in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) par value, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on to be heard after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4432 passed July 29, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of said stock is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation, to wit: the acquisition of property and the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its plant and distributing system,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 7th day of August, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, (1) That the issue and sale for cash at par by The Trappe Electric Light Company of its capital stock in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) be and the same is hereby authorized and approved.

(2) That said The Trappe Electric Light Company shall make reports to this Commission duly verified by affidavits as follows:

(a) Upon the issue and sale for cash of its stock, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue and sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said stock, and the facts and circumstances as to the property acquired and the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its plant and distributing system.

ORDER No. 4451.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of ELIZABETH S. HALL		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE		Case No. 1551.

WHEREAS, The above entitled matter having been previously set for hearing and heard on the eleventh day of July, 1918, when both parties were present or represented by counsel and the Chairman having rendered an oral opinion whereby both parties were required to do certain things, which are particularly set forth in the stenographer's record filed herein, and

WHEREAS, The Complainant in this case has filed herein on the date hereof a letter advising the Commission that its rulings as set forth

in the oral opinion of its Chairman have been complied with, thereby satisfying the complaint,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This ninth day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the Secretary be, and he is hereby, directed to enter the above mentioned complaint as satisfied and closed.

OPINION.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, in Respect to the Fairness and Reason- ableness of Certain Industrial Power Rates.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1492.</p>
--	---	---

APPEARANCES:

For the Complainant.

W. CABELL BRUCE, ESQ., General Counsel of the Public Service Commission.

For the Protestants.

J. KEMP BARTLETT, ESQ., of Bartlett, Poe & Claggett, Counsel for the Hess Steel Corporation.

GEORGE WEEMS WILLIAMS, ESQ., of Marbury, Gosnell & Williams, Counsel for the Baltimore Dry Docks and Shipbuilding Company.

CHARLES MCHENRY HOWARD, ESQ., of Venable, Baetjer & Howard, Counsel for Davison Chemical Company, Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Mills, Standard Guano Company, Central Foundry Company, and Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company.

W. IRVINE CROSS, ESQ., Counsel for the Baugh Chemical Company.

EDWARD DUFFY, ESQ., Counsel for the Baltimore Car and Foundry Company.

For the Respondent.

CHARLES MARKELL, Esq., of Haman, Cook, Chesnut & Markell,
Counsel for Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Com-
pany of Baltimore.

Hearings: March 20, 21, 27, 28; April 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18;
May 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 1918.

Arguments: May 29, 31; June 1, 3, 1918.

By the Commission.

Filed August 9, 1918.

This case involves the electrical rates of the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore City.

It is the direct outgrowth of a complaint filed February 13, 1918, by the Hess Steel Corporation (Case No. 1473), attacking certain of these rates as excessive, unfair and unreasonable. At the conclusion of the opening statements in that case it was suggested that by reason of a provision in the Public Service Commission Law an investigation of the reasonableness of electric rates could not properly be had upon the complaint of a single individual. Thereupon this Commission, of its own motion, as by law provided, filed a complaint "that the rates and charges charged and collected by said (respondent) company under the provisions of Supplement No. 17 to Schedule T-2, headed 'Industrial Power Fixed Charge Rates, Etc.,' of its tariff schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4, are excessive, unjust and unreasonable." An answer was filed by the company denying these charges, and the case came to a hearing March 20, 1918.

Meanwhile a number of other industrial customers of the company intervened with formal or informal complaints as to the above and other industrial electric rates of the respondent company, and were represented by counsel at the hearings.

During the course of such hearings and in the arguments which succeeded the same, it was generally conceded that all the industrial electric rates of the company were to be considered and passed upon by the Commission. The taking of testimony consumed seventeen days, and the arguments of counsel four additional days. The record embraces 3,324 typewritten pages and over one hundred exhibits, many of which are tabulated statements of figures.

It would be impossible for this Commission, within the limits of any ordinary opinion, to review at length this great mass of testimony or enter into any detailed analysis of the multitudinous figures contained in such tabulations.

Indeed, such a course is in no sense necessary, for the reason that the questions involved must be decided in accord with certain broad fundamental principles which, in our opinion, are clearly decisive thereof.

The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore is engaged in the business of furnishing gas and electricity for

domestic and commercial purposes to the public of Baltimore City and portions of Baltimore, Howard and Anne Arundel Counties. It has a virtual monopoly in the field which it serves.

In comparatively recent years its business has increased enormously. A large part of this increase has been in its industrial electrical service, the proportionate growth in this line of its business having been greater than in any other.

The following table, prepared by the Commission's Auditor, indicates both the nature and extent of this growth in the company's sales of electrical current and gas:

TABLE I

GROWTH OF COMPANY'S BUSINESS

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	<i>Years Ending June 30th</i>					
	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917
<i>Electrical—</i>						
Domestic and commercial.....	1,795	1,987	2,248	2,415	2,674	2,356
Industrial	254	296	446	451	734	1,888
Municipal	286	290	384	438	483	526
Totals.....	2,335	*2,572	3,078	3,304	3,891	4,770
<i>Gas—</i>						
Domestic and commercial.....	2,920	3,114	3,133	3,223	3,293	3,521
Municipal	75	77	85	91	98	104
Totals.....	2,995	3,191	*3,217	3,314	3,391	3,625
Grand Total.....	5,330	5,763	6,295	6,618	*7,283	8,395

* Apparent errors in addition due to dropping hundreds.

On June 30, 1917, the company had 180,501 customers, made up as follows:

TABLE II
NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS
(As of June 30, 1917)

	<i>Number</i>	<i>Pct. of Whole</i>	<i>Gross Revenues</i>	<i>Pct. of Whole</i>
<i>Electricity—</i>				
Domestic and commercial...	49,262	99.327	2,856,116	49.391
Industrial	320	.645	1,887,984	39.557
Municipal	14	.028	526,242	11.032
Totals.....	49,596	100.000	4,770,342	100.000
<i>Gas—</i>				
Domestic and commercial...	130,821	99.936	3,373,651	93.073
Industrial	80	.061	145,045	4.001
Municipal	4	.003	106,049	2.926
Totals.....	130,905	100.000	3,624,745	100.000
Grand Total.....	180,501		8,395,087	

Many of the above were users of both gas and electricity, and the total is therefore, to that extent, misleading as to the number of individual customers, although still indicative of the great proportion of the inhabitants of Baltimore City who are interested in the rates charged by the respondent company.

As shown by the above tables, during the year ended June 30, 1917, the company's industrial electric consumers were 320 in number, formed .0064½ per cent. (about two-thirds of 1 per cent.) of its total electrical consumers, but paid 39.58 per cent. of the company's gross revenues from its electrical business, and 22.48 per cent. of its gross operating revenues from its combined gas and electrical business.

In a letter to the Commission bearing date November 28, 1917, Mr. Herbert A. Wagner, president of the respondent company, stated that the total number of electric customers served by his company at that date was 51,626, and that the number of kilowatt hours supplied to the industrial consumers under the schedules herein involved was 55 per cent. of the company's total sales of electrical energy, in addition to which the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company used at that time 29 per cent. of the company's electrical output under a special contract rate filed with the Commission, thus leaving 16 per cent. of the company's entire electrical output consumed by its domestic, commercial and municipal customers.

Assuming that the above figures were approximately the same as they would have been June 30, 1917, the date used in Table II, it will thus be seen that, although the industrial customers (including the

Copper Company) consumed approximately 84 per cent. of the company's entire electrical output, the gross revenues derived therefrom were but approximately 40 per cent. of the company's entire revenues from its electrical business.

In 1912-13 this Commission had occasion to consider the gas and electric rates of the respondent company upon complaints of David Bachrach and others as to the price of electricity to small consumers, and of James H. Preston, Mayor of Baltimore City, as to the prices of both gas and electricity generally. The investigation resulting from these complaints was most exhaustive, and the opinion of this Commission filed January 13, 1913, will be found in 4 P. S. C. of Md. Reports (1913), pp. 39-58. On the same day the Commission entered its Order No. 1037 (p. 59), reducing the primary rate for electric service from ten cents per kilowatt hour to eight and one-half cents, and its Order No. 1038 (p. 60), reducing the primary or retail rate for gas from one dollar per thousand cubic feet, subject to a discount of ten cents for payment within ten days, to ninety cents, subject to such discount. These rates were to become effective July 1, 1913. The petitions in the above cases attacked the reasonableness of the maximum or primary rates only, but the orders in both instances directed the company to revise its schedules of rates to conform to the primary rates so established.

The company filed its electrical schedules accordingly, establishing a primary rate of $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents per kilowatt hour, and making the monthly minimum charge \$1. That portion of the above schedules relating to a monthly minimum charge was not in accord with the Commission's opinion, and on June 25, 1913, Order No. 1261 was passed providing for a yearly minimum charge of \$12 in lieu of the monthly charge of \$1 proposed by the company (Vol. 4, pp. 227-8).

The secondary rates to ordinary domestic and commercial consumers ranged from five cents to two cents per kilowatt hour, depending upon the customer's rated demand.

At the date of the filing of the above opinion the company's industrial electric business was relatively of but small importance, having formed during the year ended June 30, 1912, but 10.8 per cent. of its entire electrical business and 4.7 per cent. of its total gas and electrical business, as contrasted with 39.58 per cent. and 22.48 per cent., respectively, during the year ended June 30, 1917. The Commission made no attempt in its opinion or orders to regulate the rates charged for this character of service.

These industrial rates, embodied now in Schedules known as S, S-2, S-3, T, T-2 and U, were originally filed with the Commission May 1, 1910. They were designed for large power, industrial and railroad users, and by reason of the wholesale nature of the service and other considerations, prescribed prices for current far below those charged domestic and ordinary commercial consumers, such industrial rates ranging from one-half cent upwards per kilowatt hour. These schedules all provided that the customers should sign contracts for perma-

nent service at the rates prescribed therein for fixed terms, three years in the cases of Schedules S and S-2 and five years in the cases of Schedules T, T-2, S-3 and U.

The above rates remained in effect, with a slight modification made in Schedules T and T-2 on May 1, 1911, until October 24, 1912, when the company put in effect what was in substance a discount of 10 per cent. from the schedule charges for ordinary 25-cycle high-tension service, and of 20 per cent. where hydro-electric service acquired from the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company was furnished, unsupplemented by steam-generated current.

The above rates, primary, secondary and industrial, remained substantially as above stated until April 1, 1917, when the company voluntarily reduced the primary rate for electric current from 8½ cents to 8 cents per kilowatt hour and the annual minimum charge from \$12 to \$9. At the same time the company reduced the number of hours charged for at the primary rate, thus giving its domestic and commercial customers greater benefits from its lower secondary rates. As of the same date the company added to its industrial Schedules T, T-2 and U, applicable to all contracts entered into after that date, a provision designed to increase or decrease the prices therein stipulated, 33/1000 cent per kilowatt hour, "for each 10 per cent. of increase or decrease from the normal cost to the company of \$2.70 per ton for bituminous coal, delivered at the company's generating station during that month." This was termed a "Fuel-Rate-Adjustment," and was designed, according to a letter from the president of the company to the Commission under date November 28, 1917, to alter the price of electric current furnished under such schedules "by the amount by which variations in the cost of coal affect the cost of producing electrical energy."

On September 9, 1917, the company withdrew from its Schedules T and T-2, the clause permitting a discount of 20 per cent. for unsupplemented hydro-electric service which had been added to these schedules October 24, 1912, the explanation being that the demands for this particular class of service had increased to such an extent that it was impracticable for the company to continue contracting to furnish the same. Incidentally the company about this time persuaded a number of industrial customers to relinquish the benefit of their existing contracts for this class of service on the ground that it was no longer able to give reasonable assurances as to its continuity or reliability. The actual effect of this change was to increase the high-tension industrial rates to many of the company's customers by 12½ per cent.

Meanwhile the company had entered into a large number of contracts for industrial electrical service. According to President Wagner's letter of November 28, 1917, above referred to, there were 327 customers at that time served under the industrial schedules, this number being made up of 295 under Schedules S, S-2 and S-3, 29 under Schedules T and T-2, and 3 under Schedule U.

These contracts were of three general classes:

(1) Contracts to receive and pay for current at schedule rates, accompanied by the company's guarantee that the charges would not exceed a definite sum set forth in the contract;

(2) Contracts to receive and pay for current at schedule rates, without any guarantee as above, but entered into prior to April 1, 1917, the date upon which the fuel-rate-adjustment clause was added to Schedules T, T-2 and U; and

(3) Contracts to receive and pay for current at schedule rates, without guarantee, and entered into subsequent to April 1, 1917.

In addition, there was outstanding at that time a contract between the company and the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company, executed April 18, 1910, under which the Electric Company had agreed to furnish the Copper Company for a period of ten years, subject to an automatic renewal for a further period of five years unless terminated by the Copper Company, electric energy in large quantity at a net price of 4.68 mills, or less than $\frac{1}{2}$ cent, per kilowatt hour. Under this contract the Copper Company was using 29 per cent. of the company's entire electrical output at the above exceedingly low rate, and was by a considerable amount the Electric Company's largest individual customer.

Such being the situation with respect to the respondent company's industrial electric business, the company on November 28, 1917, filed with the Commission, to become effective January 1, 1918, Supplements Nos. 16 to 21, inclusive, to its electric rate schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4, Supplements 16 and 17 being subsequently reissued in Supplements 26 and 27.

The changes effected by these supplements (with the possible exception of Supplement No. 21, which covers Schedule B rates, domestic and comparatively small commercial users, and which schedule has not been directly involved in these proceedings) may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Application of "fuel-rate-adjustment" clause to all customers served under existing or new contracts under Schedules S, S-2, T, T-2 and U, this clause providing that:

"The net price for each kilowatt hour of electric energy supplied under this schedule shall be subject each month to adjustment by increase or decrease, according to the average cost of coal delivered to the company's main generating plant coal bunkers during that month. This adjustment shall be based upon the relation between the variation in the generating cost of electric energy per kilowatt hour and variations in the cost of coal from a normal cost of \$2.70 per long ton, which shall be taken as .01 (1/100) cent per kilowatt hour for

each 3 per cent. change in the cost of coal. This adjustment shall be made to the nearest one-hundredth of a cent per kilowatt hour."

2. Abandonment of "non-peak service."

3. "Harmonizing feature" designed to make Schedules S and S-2, and Schedules T and T-2 more closely approximate each other, Schedule S-2 having always provided that it would give substantially the same results as Schedule S, and Schedule T-2 having carried like provision respecting its relation to Schedule T. This was effected by increasing the rates under Schedules S-2 and T-2 for certain blocks, and by decreasing the rate in last step of Schedule T.

These changes in the company's existing schedules were designed to affect all its industrial customers, and in effect to abrogate to a very material extent their contracts for service in their most important particular, to wit: the price at which electrical service was in future to be furnished. In short, their effect was to write into those contracts at the mere will of one of the contracting parties, prices substantially higher in each instance than the other party had ever agreed to pay, and incidentally terms entirely different from those to which the parties had solemnly agreed.

Legal Status of the Contracts

The respondent company contends that the application of the fuel-rate-adjustment to all its industrial customers, including the Copper Company and other customers with unexpired contracts which contain no fuel-rate-adjustment clause, is lawful, reasonable and necessary to provide reasonable compensation for the service rendered, and to avoid unjust discrimination against other customers, and that such application of the fuel-rate-adjustment clause does not violate existing contracts.

Counsel for the Baltimore Dry Docks and Shipbuilding Company, one of the protestants, discussed this proposition in his oral argument and printed brief, concluding in the latter as follows:

"It would seem, therefore, to be settled in this State that all contracts made by the Gas Company, whether before or after the creation of this Commission, are subject to change and regulation by this Commission. * * * While in the Gregg case above cited (121 Md. 1) no special emphasis or discussion of the validity of the contracts between the Telephone Company and certain of its patrons was given in the opinion of the Court of Appeals, yet the result of that opinion was, however, to wipe out such contracts."

Counsel for the Hess Steel Corporation said upon this subject in his printed brief:

"We do not deny that this Commission, in the exercise of that part of the sovereignty of the State of Maryland which

has been delegated to it, has the power to strike down any contract between a public service corporation and its customers.

"Nor do we deny that cases may arise where it would become the duty of this Commission to exercise such power.

"We do, however, most emphatically assert that such a case has not been established by this record."

Counsel for the Davison Chemical Company, Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Mills, Standard Guano Company, Central Foundry Company and Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company, in his brief filed on behalf of all the above protestants, said upon this point:

"We do not intend to here raise the question whether or not any alteration of the rates specified in these existing contracts, made in pursuance of the police power which the State has delegated to the Public Service Commission, would be a violation of the constitutional prohibition against impairing the obligation of contracts. For the purpose of this case we may accept that question as being settled by the decision of the Court of Appeals, and by the weight of authority elsewhere. *Yeatman vs. Public Service Commission*, 126 Md. 513.

"The question in the present case is a different one, and may be expressed as whether or not the proper exercise of the police power so conferred upon the Commission requires it, in the present case, to relieve the company from the obligation of such contracts; which are admittedly valid contracts, and are only subject to be relieved against by a proper exercise of the police power of the State, subject to which all contracts and other engagements are made."

Counsel for the Baltimore Car and Foundry Company, who filed no printed brief in the case, stated in substance in his oral argument that he agreed with counsel for the other protestants that "the Commission has a perfect right to ignore contracts, when absolutely necessary to do so," but contended that the effect of the contract was at least to throw the burden upon the company to establish that any proposed increase in the contract rate was a proper one, and to preclude the company from attempting to impose upon the holders of such contracts burdens which should properly be borne by other classes of customers.

At the conclusion of the arguments the Commission requested its General Counsel for an opinion as to how far, if at all, the Commission would be bound by such contracts in determining the issues involved in the several complaints against the amended rates of the respondent company.

On June 26, General Counsel Bruce filed an opinion upon this point, and, in the course of the same, said:

"I entertain no doubt that if, in the opinion of the Commission, the new industrial power rates of the Electric Company are just and reasonable, it is authorized to declare them so, despite the contracts above mentioned, and to thereby establish them as applicable to the consumers who are parties to those contracts; or that, if in its opinion, these rates are excessive, unjust, unreasonable or discriminatory, it is authorized to declare them so, leaving the published rates on which the contracts are based in force. So far as the authority of the Commission over rates is concerned, the contracts have no restraining efficacy at all. The contractual form which has been attempted to be given to the rates mentioned in these writings is mere drapery, which it can push aside at pleasure. Any other conclusion would, in my opinion, be repugnant not only to the paramount nature of its police powers and to the direct letter of the Public Service Commission Law, but also to the leading purposes of that law. One of its main objects was to procure adequacy of service from electric companies for the public; and adequate service electric companies cannot give unless they have adequate income, and they might well be deprived of adequate income and, in consequence, the public of adequate service, if they could barter away power at fixed-term rates beyond the control of the Commission. Such a rate might be adequate enough for the purposes of adequacy of service at the beginning of a contract term of three or five years, but become materially or totally inadequate for the purposes of adequacy of service before the end of the term, because of radical disturbances in economic conditions worked by the enhanced cost of labor or of supplies, due to a strike, insurrection or war, or some other cause. Corporations of a purely private nature may well be left to protect themselves against such hazards in such ways as may be open to them, but an electric company is a public service agency charged with duties of high import to the public, and it is of vital concern to the public that its ability to render adequate service at all times to the public should be safeguarded by the power of the Commission to allow it at any time to exact any maximum rate that the Commission may reasonably believe to be necessary to render it competent, despite any and all passing economic disturbances, to give to the public the adequate service to which the public is entitled.

"Another main object of the Public Service Commission Law was to terminate the unjust—if not scandalous—discriminations in the matter of rates as between different patrons of public service corporations, which had brought so much well-deserved odium upon the administration of such corporations. Under the operation of the law, it was intended that there should be no differences in rates as between ship-

pers or consumers, except such as might be justly founded upon classifications of shippers or consumers suggested by real dissimilarities of situation and needs. This intention would be frustrated if an electric company were at liberty to enter into three or five year contracts for a fixed rate with some of its patrons, and afterwards to file with the Commission a schedule fixing a higher rate for future applications for exactly the same service. The effect of clothing an electric company with such a power would be, it seems to me, to create two classes of patrons separated from each other by none but wholly unreasonable, not to say invidious principles of distinction. From the very nature of the mischiefs inherent in the discrimination at which the Public Service Commission Law was largely aimed, it seems to me that no differences between the patrons of an electric company based merely upon the fact that some enjoy fixed rates evidenced by written-term contracts, and some do not, can be countenanced by the Commission."

Among the decisions cited by the Commission's general counsel in support of the above opinion were:

Yeatman vs. Towers, 126 Md. 513.
L. & N. Ry. Co. vs. Mottley, 219 U. S. 467.
Armour Packing Co. vs. U. S., 209 U. S. 56.

Other cases cited by counsel for the respondent company in support of his contention as first above stated were:

Washington Co. Water Co. Case, 6 P. S. C. Md. 322.
Yeatman vs. Suburban Water Co., 5 P. S. C. Md. 533.
Onondaga Golf Club vs. S. & S. R. Co., 160 N. Y. Supp. 693.
C. I. & L. Ry. Co. vs. U. S., 219 U. S. 486.
Pinney & Boyle Co. vs. Los Angeles Gas and Elec. Corp., 168 Cal. 12; L. R. A. 1915-C, 282 and note.
Wolverton vs. Mountain States Tel. Co., 58 Colo. 58; Ann. Cas. 1916-C, 776, 778-79.
Raymond Lumber Co. vs. Raymond Light and Water Co., 92 Wash. 330; P. U. R. 1916-F, 437; L. R. A. 1917-C, 574.
Union Dry Goods Co. vs. Georgia P. S. C., 142 Ga. 841; L. R. A. 1916-E, 358.
Application of Macon Ry. & L. Co., 41 Ann. Rep. Ga. Ry. Comm. 259, 261, 277-78.
Collingswood Sewerage Co. vs. Collingswood (N. J. Supreme Court), 102 Atl. 901; P. U. R. 1918-C, 261, 269-70.

From the foregoing extracts from briefs and arguments of counsel for the holders of the contracts here involved, it would seem to be virtually a concession in this case that this Commission has the abso-

lute right, subject of course to review by the courts, to alter the rates prescribed in such contracts, if, in its judgment, the interests of the general public require that such course be pursued.

It would further seem to be well established that it is the duty of the Commission to strike down such contract rates if they are found to result in undue or unreasonable discrimination among different classes of the company's patrons or between individual patrons, this latter duty arising, not under the police powers of the State, but out of the plain provisions of the Public Service Commission Law (Sec. 31½), declaring such contracts unlawful and empowering the Commission to fix and determine the proper charges to be made for service under any and all circumstances.

The Police Power of the State

It is conceded on all sides that if the contract rates are to be changed upon the first ground above stated, it must be done in the exercise by this Commission of the police power of the State.

This concession precludes at once any contention that such alteration of rates should be made out of any consideration of the alleged rights of the stockholders of the respondent company to reasonable compensation for the service rendered, a contention to which a great amount of the testimony adduced on behalf of the respondent company was addressed. The police power of the State is not a thing to be exercised for the purpose of relieving stockholders from bargains which turn out to be unfortunate to them. And if such be the indirect effect of a proper application of the police power of the State, it is but incidental, and should neither be used as a reason for exercising the police power, nor as a reason for refusing to exercise the same.

Rights arising out of contracts are among the most sacred rights known to the law. So sacred, in fact, are such rights that in the foundation of our Government the States themselves declared through our Federal Constitution that no State should pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts. And while it is true that this prohibition is subject to the power in the several States to abrogate the contracts of individuals in the exercise of their reserved and inherent police powers, it is equally true that the power to abrogate a contract to the detriment of one of the parties thereto should never be exercised except in extreme cases, where it is clearly shown that it is necessary that the individual should be made to suffer for the welfare of the whole.

We have stated the case thus extremely for the reason that many of the contracts here involved present in themselves extreme cases. For instance, in the case of the first contract of the Hess Steel Corporation, there is to be found the following provision:

“With all the information and data at its disposal, the company estimates that the average rate per year to be paid by

the Hess Steel Corporation under this contract will not exceed eight-tenths cent (\$0.008) per kilowatt hour. The company will, therefore, guarantee for a trial period of three (3) years that the average rate per year paid by the Steel Corporation shall not exceed ninety-five hundredths cent (\$0.0095) per kilowatt hour."

In the case of the Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Mills there is a similar provision, except that the guaranteed maximum rate is one cent per kilowatt hour.

In the case of the Copper Company there was an absolute and unconditional contract to furnish electric energy in large quantities at a net price of 4.68 mills, or less than one-half cent per kilowatt hour for an initial term of ten years, with renewal privilege of five more.

And yet despite these contracts, the company has filed with this Commission schedules designed to increase the rates prescribed in the same, and by its Exhibit No. 75, filed in this case, has shown that the effect of one of these changes only, the "fuel-rate-adjustment" clause, would be to make the Copper Company alone pay in the first six months of the present year over \$140,000 more for electrical energy than it had contracted to pay, and the other two companies above named, together with some twenty-seven others in their class, to pay in the same period over \$150,000 more for current than they had contracted to pay.

Certainly, with rights of such moment involved, there should be made out a very clear case, indeed, in favor of the general public before the State declares, through its appointed agents, that the rights of the holders of such contracts should be annihilated in the interests of the public welfare, and that the stockholders of the Electric Company, whose representatives made such contracts, should be relieved incidentally of all consequent loss thereunder.

It is no sufficient answer to the claims of the holders of these contracts to say, as the Electric Company contends in its answer filed in the Hess Steel Corporation case, and in the arguments and brief of its counsel in the case now before us, that their holders entered into the same with the knowledge that the rates therein prescribed were subject to change at any time by the State in the exercise of its power to regulate rates charged by public service corporations, and that consequently the holders of such contracts have no right to complain when the State disregards the same entirely and prescribes reasonable rates which are higher than those prescribed therein. In fact, counsel for the Electric Company goes so far in his brief and argument as to contend that the company itself had the lawful right, despite such contracts, to increase such rates at any time by the mere filing of new rate schedules to become effective without the affirmative approval of the State at all.

The law presumes, it is true, that the holders of these contracts had knowledge of the law that the State might at any time regulate the

charges for the service therein contracted for. But neither that fact, nor the knowledge of that fact, made the contracts themselves void. They were, at most, voidable, and voidable only at the instance of the State in the exercise of its police power, and not by the other contracting party, at its own instance and subject merely to its own conceptions of what would or would not be reasonable charges under the circumstances.

Granting that the holders of these contracts had full knowledge of the right of the State to abrogate the same, it is nevertheless entirely consistent that they might well have believed that the Electric Company would live up to the same, even though in so doing the result might be that its stockholders would lose thereby. The contracts were all signed by the proper officers of the Electric Company, and these officers represented the owners of the property in making them. So long as they turned out advantageously, the owners of the property got the benefit of the same, as is evidenced by the greater dividends paid as a result thereof. Consequently, when conditions changed, and the contracts had become disadvantageous to the stockholders rather than advantageous, the latter cannot well be heard to complain that they should no longer be in force.

The nature, form and phraseology of the contracts here in question clearly differentiate many of them from ordinary short-term contracts for service at standard schedule rate. In the first place, where the contracts referred in terms to standard schedules filed with the Commission, which was not in every instance the case, such schedules themselves left it entirely optional with the company whether it would contract with other individual patrons to serve them at such schedule rates. In the second place, the service contracted for was itself a special service adapted to the requirements in some instances of only one customer, and in others to the requirements of a very small number of customers in the same class. In nearly every instance the contract was based upon the mutual conception of the parties as to what the service was actually worth to the particular customer under the circumstances of his particular case. And in the third place, the phraseology of some of the contracts, especially those containing the guarantee clause, was such as might well have led the other parties to believe that, no matter what changes might occur to affect the actual cost of service, they had in effect the agreement of the owners of the property that if loss ensued they themselves would bear such loss and not call upon such contract-holders to bear the same. Nor is it any conclusive answer to the claims of the holders of the contracts in question that such contracts were discriminatory against other patrons of the company or created preferences in favor of such contract-holders, and were for those reasons void. At the time the contracts in question were made, they were in the main neither discriminatory nor preferential. Consequently, they were not void *ab initio* upon that ground. They have since become discriminatory, if at all, by reason of the action of the Electric Company in filing new sched-

ules for the same classes of service at higher rates. But if the Electric Company could not, of its own will and without the approval of the State, avoid such contracts directly by changing the rates prescribed therein, then certainly it could not do so indirectly by the mere making of higher rates for the same service to other customers. In such case it would be the later rates and not the earlier contract rates which would be discriminatory.

The Issue

We have discussed these contracts at such length for the reason that, in the opinion of this Commission, there is but one issue in this case concerning such contracts, and inasmuch as we are called upon to decide that issue, we desire to strip the controversy of all the other issues of law and fact which have been urged upon us, and meet that issue as it stands.

That issue, simply stated, is whether or not the interests of the general public require that these contracts be in effect abrogated by the order of this Commission as the representative of the State.

Under this issue, the question before this Commission ceases to be one of the relative rights of such contract-holders and the stockholders of the respondent company, and becomes a question solely as between the relatively few customers who hold such contracts on the one hand, and the general public on the other. And in the term general public as here used we include not only those members of the general public who are at the present moment actually patrons of the company, but as well all other members of the general public who are in any way, directly or indirectly, interested in the continued ability of the respondent company to furnish the public adequate service at reasonable rates.

We have already sufficiently discussed the rights of the holders of these contracts. It remains only to discuss the rights of the general public in so far as those rights may be affected by such contracts if they are permitted to stand.

The Rights of the General Public

The respondent company has a virtual monopoly of the business of furnishing gas and electricity for domestic and commercial purposes to the inhabitants of Baltimore City and its immediate environs. As a matter of fact, its service goes in one or the other form into practically every home and place of business in Baltimore City. With the exception of water, there are no other utilities upon which the people of our community are so absolutely dependent as they are upon gas and electricity for their everyday personal and business convenience and welfare.

This importance of the company to the whole people of our city demands not only that it should be kept at all times up to such a point of financial and business efficiency that it will be able to render ade-

quate service to the public at reasonable rates from day to day and week to week, but also that it be kept at all times beyond reasonable peril of financial embarrassment, and in such a condition financially as to be able successfully to invite outside capital for investment in its stocks, bonds and securities. For a company such as this cannot be permitted to stand still. It must at all times at least keep pace with the growth of the community which it serves. Otherwise the service which is adequate today will become inadequate tomorrow.

Even now vast sums of additional capital are required by this company in order to make improvements to and extensions of its service to meet the growing demands of increased population and industrial enterprises which are daily becoming more insistent in their demands for service. The company's Exhibit No. 68 (File No. 143 in this case) shows that between now and June 30, 1922, it will require additional capital to the amount of over fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) for the making of improvements to its gas and electric properties, and that in addition, within that period, it will require over eleven million dollars (\$11,000,000) for the retirement of its outstanding bonds and other obligations maturing before that date.

The money for these purposes cannot be collected from the public through the rates charged for service. It must all come from outside sources—from those who may be found willing to invest their money in the enterprise upon the faith of receiving through the rates charged for service a fair and reasonable return upon their investment.

It is to the direct interest of the public of Baltimore City and its environs that all these things be done, since they all speak for adequate service, and unless they are done the company will be unable to continue to render such adequate service. The stockholders and bondholders, it may be true, stand to be benefited to the extent of the return which they receive upon their investment, but the public stands equally to be benefited by the service which it receives.

Where such service is adequate and the rates charged therefor reasonable, the mutuality of interest between the stockholders and bondholders on the one hand and the public on the other is as near absolute as it is possible for it in the nature of things to be. It is that mutuality of interest in the property and affairs of our public utilities which it is the purpose of our Public Service Commission Law to promote, and which can only be promoted to the greatest advantage when our utilities are required to render adequate service and the public is required to pay reasonable rates for such service.

If, therefore, it be found from the evidence before us in this case that for the respondent company to continue to furnish electrical current to the holders of the contracts here involved at the rates prescribed therein would render the company unable to furnish adequate service to its remaining 130,000 patrons, and through them to practically the whole people of Baltimore City and its environs, then certainly under such circumstances the State would be clearly justified in exercising its inherent power to strike down such private contracts

to the extent, at least, of requiring their holders to bear their fair share of the entire cost of furnishing adequate service to the whole public.

These principles being decided, the next question is, whether or not the continuance of the particular contract rates here involved would be in fact so far inimical to the interests of the general public as to require reasonable increases in such rates.

Necessity for Increased Revenues

Exhibit Wagner No. 73 shows that the company's total sales of electrical current during the year ended June 30, 1918, were 332,478,318 kilowatt hours, made up as follows:

TABLE III

	<i>k. w. h.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Industrial	182,742,956	55
Copper works.....	96,121,950	28.9
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals.....	278,864,906	83.9
Not covered by fuel rate adjustment...	53,613,412	16.1
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals.....	332,478,318	100.0

Exhibit Wagner No. 74 shows estimated sales for the year ending June 30, 1919, as follows:

TABLE IV

	<i>k. w. h.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Industrial	251,236,239	44.3
U. S. War Department.....	120,960,000	21.4
Copper works.....	138,300,000	24.4
Not covered by fuel rate adjustment...	56,243,239	9.9
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals.....	566,739,478	100.0

Table No. II in this opinion shows the relative importance of the above industrial electrical business to the whole business of the company during the year ended June 30, 1917, as follows:

TABLE V

	<i>Gross Revenues</i>	<i>Pct. of Whole</i>
<i>Electricity—</i>		
Domestic and commercial.....	\$2,356,116	49.391
Industrial	1,887,984	39.557
Municipal	526,242	11.032
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals.....	\$4,770,342	100.000
<i>Gas</i>	3,624,745	
	<hr/>	
Total.....	\$8,395,087	

Only a portion of the company's industrial electrical consumers hold contracts entered into prior to April 1, 1917, and which are, therefore, not subject to the fuel-rate-adjustment clause.

Section 31½ of the Public Service Commission Law contains the following provision:

"No * * * electrical corporation shall directly, by any special rate * * * or charges, demand, collect or receive from any person or corporation a greater or less compensation for gas or electricity, or for any service rendered * * * than it charges, demands, collects or receives from any other person or corporation for doing a like and contemporaneous service with respect thereto, under the same or substantially similar circumstances or conditions."

Under this section, to approve the rates prescribed in the contracts entered into prior to April 1, 1917, would require the Commission to prescribe the same rates to all other industrial consumers falling within the classes covered by such contracts, since the section absolutely precludes the possibility of there being two different rates for the same class of service furnished at the same time under substantially similar circumstances. The Legislature has spoken clearly and emphatically to this effect, and has left this Commission no discretion in the matter. This would mean that if the old contract rates were approved, there could be no fuel rate adjustment, or any other increase in the rates charged the industrial consumers, no matter how great the needs of the company might be for increased revenues. It would further mean either that the company should do without such increased revenues, or in order to obtain the same would be obliged to impose upon the remaining electrical customers, who consumed but 16 per cent. of the entire electrical output last year, and upon the gas consumers, who as such consume no part of such electrical output, the whole burden of which the consumers of 84 per cent. of the electrical output should properly bear their part.

Exhibit Wagner No. 75 shows the following actual and estimated yield from the fuel rate adjustment effective April 1, 1917, as revised January 1, 1918:

TABLE VI

Six months to June 30, 1918:

Industrial	63,484,576 k.w.h. at \$0.003	\$272,011.61
Copper Company...	48,733,750 k.w.h. at \$0.0029	142,616.10
Totals.....	112,218,328	\$414,627.71

Twelve months to June 30, 1919 (est.):

Industrial	372,196,239 k.w.h. at \$0.003	\$1,116,588.72
Copper Company...	138,300,000 k.w.h. at \$0.003	414,900.00
Totals.....	510,496,239	\$1,531,488.72

If we were to exclude the Copper Company on the ground urged by its counsel, that it is in a special class and, therefore, not bound by what may be done with respect to the industrial consumers as a class, we would then find that the differential in its favor enjoyed by it under its original contract would be increased still further, i. e., to the extent of approximately three mills per kilowatt hour at the present price of coal. While the original differential in favor of the Copper Company would seem to have been justified by the character of the service supplied to it, and was therefore not unduly preferential, to add to that differential to the further extent of approximately three mills per kilowatt hour by requiring other large consumers to pay the fuel rate adjustment and relieve the Copper Company therefrom, would be, in the opinion of this Commission, to make the Copper Company's contract rate unduly preferential. Therefore, if it be found necessary to increase the industrial schedule rates in order to enable the Electric Company to render adequate service, the Copper Company contract rates will have to be raised to the same extent.

Exhibit Wagner No. 32, filed in this case, as revised by a statement more recently filed showing actual results for the year ended June 30, 1918, shows the following operating results of the company for the years ended June 30, 1912, to June 30, 1918, inclusive, on the basis of charges in effect before the fuel rate adjustment was inaugurated, our figures showing even thousands of dollars and omitting hundreds:

TABLE VII

<i>Year</i>	<i>Gross Income</i>	<i>Op. Exp., Taxes and Dep'n</i>	<i>Net Earnings</i>	<i>Pct. of Income</i>
1912.....	\$5,465,000	\$3,096,000	\$2,367,000	43.5
1913.....	6,115,000	3,423,000	2,692,000	44
1914.....	6,401,000	4,094,000	2,307,000	36
1915.....	6,789,000	4,162,000	2,627,000	38
1916.....	7,432,000	4,398,000	3,034,000	40
1917.....	8,499,000	5,080,000	3,419,000	40
1918.....	10,302,000	7,171,000	3,131,000	30

Exhibit Wagner No. 69 purports to show the present value of the property as of each of the above dates on the basis of this Company's former valuation of the company's property, with yearly additions at cost and accretions to working capital, but not including certain additional easements assessed for taxation on June 30, 1917, at \$1,608,803, which amount somewhat exceeds the company's present reserves for depreciation, as shown in Exhibit Wagner No. 69-A. We use these figures simply for purposes of illustration and not with any idea of determining any controverted questions of fact in so doing. A comparison of these figures with the figures shown in Table VII, *supra*, shows the following results:

TABLE VIII

(Value of property as of June 30, 1912, to June 30, 1918, inclusive, on above basis, as compared with actual net earnings shown in Table VII, both expressed in even thousands of dollars, with resulting rates of return expressed in percentages.)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Net Earnings</i>	<i>Rate of Return</i>
1912.....	\$26,417,000	\$2,367,000	9.0%
1913.....	28,779,000	2,692,000	9.3%
1914.....	30,415,000	2,307,000	7.6%
1915.....	31,692,000	2,627,000	8.3%
1916.....	33,704,000	3,034,000	8.9%
1917.....	36,904,000	3,419,000	9.2%
1918.....	43,478,000	3,131,000	7.2%

While the above amounts and percentages are not quite the same as those used in the exhibits, Wagner Nos. 69 and 69-A, due to the fact that we have adopted slightly different methods of setting up the figures in order to conform more nearly to our general practice in computing rates of return, the effect of our table is the same as that of the Wagner exhibits in demonstrating conclusively a sharp falling off in relative net earnings during the year ended June 30, 1918, despite the great increase that year in the company's business, a fact which is also shown conclusively by Table VII.

We must next seek the reason for this fact.

Exhibit Wagner No. 24 contains the following significant figures with reference to comparative costs of boiler coal and labor used in connection with the company's electrical operations:

TABLE IX

(Years Ended June 30)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Coal Per Ton</i>	<i>Av'ge Pay Per Annum Per Employee</i>
1912.....	\$2.629	\$676.68
1913.....	2.626	702.42
1914.....	2.667	696.49
1915.....	2.761	724.42
1916.....	2.739	747.60
1917.....	3.384	788.30
1918.....	4.554	980.55

Exhibit Wagner No. 25 contains the following figures with reference to comparative costs of (A) oil per gallon; (B) generator coal per ton; (C) boiler coal per ton, and (D) labor per annum per employee used in the production of gas during the above period:

TABLE X

<i>Year</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
1912.....	2.400c	\$4.805	\$2.597	\$676.68
1913.....	2.915c	4.956	2.844	702.42
1914.....	4.696c	5.212	2.607	696.49
1915.....	4.266c	5.393	2.592	724.42
1916.....	2.825c	5.163	2.710	747.60
1917.....	2.808c	5.312	3.309	788.30
1918.....	6.785c	6.572	4.713	980.55

An examination of other exhibits in the case, showing operating expenses in detail, discloses at a glance the predominating part which coal, oil, labor and materials take in making up the aggregate operating expenses of a gas and electric company. Exhibit Wagner No. 46 shows the extent to which the prices of certain materials used by the company and properly chargeable to operation have increased since 1915.

A glance at Tables VIII, IX and X, *supra*, will show that, taking 1912 and 1913 at one end of the scale and 1918 at the other, the company's rate of return upon its assumed investment has decreased inversely with the increased cost of coal, oil, labor and materials.

That such conditions cannot be permitted to continue indefinitely should go without saying.

Problems in financing are notoriously more difficult today, and presumably will continue to grow more difficult in the immediate future, than they were in the past few years, when a considerable portion of the respondent company's bonded indebtedness was issued. All such issues, as well as the company's stock issues of various kinds, have been made since 1910 under the direct supervision and with the approval of this Commission. We are thoroughly familiar with the difficulties which have confronted our public service corporations in the past in floating such capital issues, and are to a considerable degree aware of the greater difficulties which will confront them in the future.

The tables above referred to and the exhibits upon which they are based show tendencies, if nothing else. And without pausing to analyze such exhibits at length and correct relatively minor errors which counsel for the industrial consumers contend some of them contain, the one predominant fact stands out that, unless the respondent company gets increased revenues in large amounts through increases in at least some of its rates, or unless some miraculous event shall immediately transpire to restore its operating conditions to their pre-war status, said company will speedily pass into a condition of

pecuniary want and financial difficulties which will not only make it impossible to render the public adequate service during the remainder of the war, but as well for many years to come.

The evidence before us shows conclusively that if the large electrical customers of the company should by order of this Commission be relieved entirely from all burden of the increased costs of operation due to war conditions, the whole burden of such increased costs would have to be imposed either upon the remaining electrical consumers or upon the company's gas consumers, or both.

As to the propriety of an order placing these increased costs upon the smaller electrical consumers, both the Electric Company in its answer in the Hess Steel Corporation case, and counsel for the company in his brief and argument in the case now immediately before us, virtually admitted that under existing conditions the rates to this class of consumers should not be increased. This point was virtually conceded also by several of the counsel for the industrial consumers.

The case of the gas consumers, it is true, is before us, but the case has not yet come to hearing, and consequently neither the company nor the public has been heard thereon.

The evidence in this case shows conclusively that a great proportion of the company's increased operating costs due to war conditions has been incurred directly in connection with its electrical business, and that its gross income from its electrical business is approximately one-third greater than its gross income from its gas business. There is also evidence in the case now before us to the effect that the company's net returns from its gas business upon its investment in that branch are less than its net returns from its electrical business upon the investment in that branch.

Counsel for the industrial consumers have, accordingly, contended that their clients should not be required to bear any portion of the shortage in returns from the gas business. Counsel for the Electric Company conceded in his oral argument that the respondent company "cannot conduct the gas business at a loss and pay for it out of the electric business, or *vice versa*" (Record of arguments, p. 256, also pp. 264-5). Authorities were cited to this effect. How far this principle goes, or to what extent it should be applied under the circumstances of any particular case, are questions which this Commission will not decide in this case, under the above circumstances; but, no matter how limited or unlimited our application of the principle may hereafter be, the principle itself certainly establishes the proposition that the whole burden of the extra cost of serving the industrial electrical consumers cannot properly be imposed upon the company's gas consumers.

For the reasons stated, it follows that, notwithstanding the strong contractual and equitable rights which we have found to exist in the cases of the holders of many of the contracts, the rates therein prescribed must be declared unreasonably low and unduly preferential. This ruling applies as well to the special contract of the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company.

Reasonable Industrial Rates

The company's electric commercial service schedules in effect prior to January 1, 1918, were as follows:

Schedule A. Transient Lighting and Power Rates; rate, 8c. per k.w.h.

Schedule B. Yearly Lighting and Power Rates; rates, primary, 8c. per k.w.h.; secondary, 5c. per k.w.h. to a minimum of 3c. per k.w.h. Yearly contract required.

Schedule F. Auxiliary, Breakdown, or Summer Service Schedule; rates, service charge and fixed costs as prescribed, running costs as in Schedule S. Yearly contract required.

Schedule S. Industrial Rates—General Service; rates, fixed costs as prescribed, running costs varying from 4½c. per k.w.h. to a minimum of 8/10c. per k.w.h.

Schedule S-2. Fixed Rate Power—General Service; rates, fixed charges as prescribed, with additional charge or abatement of 1c. per k.w.h. where use varies from demand.

Schedule S-3. Collective Application of Schedule S; rates as in Schedule S.

Schedule T. High-Tension Transmission Line Service; rates, fixed costs as prescribed, running costs from 9/10c. per k.w.h. to 6/10c. per k.w.h., subject to discount under certain circumstances and to fuel rate adjustment.

Schedule T-2. Industrial Power—Fixed Charge Rates—High Tension Transmission Line Service; rates, fixed charges as prescribed, with additional charge or abatement of from 9/10c. to 5/10c. per k.w.h. where use varies from demand, subject to discount under certain circumstances and to fuel rate adjustment.

Schedule U. Permanent Railway Power Generating Station Rates; rates, fixed costs as prescribed, running costs varying from 9/10c. per k.w.h. to 5/10c. per k.w.h.

Throughout this opinion we have from time to time, for convenience, but somewhat inaccurately, referred to "industrial rates" as embracing all the company's larger wholesale rates which are embodied in its Schedules F, S, S-2, S-3, T, T-2, U and its most recent Schedule R, which was filed to cover the case of the Baltimore Copper Rolling and Smelting Company. The Schedules F, U and R are intended to be embraced in our general designation "Industrial Rates," wherever that term appears, unless otherwise clearly indicated. Schedules A and B are not intended to be so embraced.

Having reached the conclusion that the contract rates involved in this proceeding must be declared unreasonably low and unduly preferential, and this finding involving all the industrial rates of the company in force prior to the filing of the schedules containing the fuel-rate-adjustment clause, it remains to be seen what industrial rates would be fair.

President Wagner, of the Consolidated Company, in his letter to the Commission of November 28, 1917, accompanying certain revised schedules designed to become effective January 1, 1918, explained that the amendments to Schedule S-2 were designed to make that schedule harmonize with Schedule S and be simply another form of billing for service in accordance with the base Schedule S. There were also amendments to Schedules T and T-2 for the same purpose, the last step in Schedule 2 also being lowered. Other amendments to Schedules B, S, S-2, T and T-2 were explained as bearing upon the "demand" and "non-peak service" features of those schedules. Mr. Wagner also referred to other amendments applying a new form of fuel rate adjustment to Schedules S, S-2, S-3, T, T-2 and U.

Several of the above changes tended to increase the revenues derived from the electrical consumers, but the main source of anticipated additional revenue was the fuel rate adjustment, the effect of which in a general way has hereinbefore been seen. We will, therefore, consider this clause first.

Fuel Rate Adjustment

In his letter to the Commission of November 28, 1917, above referred to, President Wagner stated concerning the fuel-rate-adjustment clause:

"On the basis of adjustment provided, the company seeks to obtain, and will obtain, only the additional cost of operation and service supply due to the increased cost of coal alone, which has become extraordinarily excessive and extremely burdensome. * * * That the increased cost of fuel for the production of electricity has become a great burden upon the company is evident, when it is understood that * * * the increase of \$1.7936 per ton for the amount of coal used amounts to an increased cost of nearly \$42,000 a month, or nearly one-half a million dollars a year. It is estimated that the fuel rate adjustment as applied to the schedules named would increase the revenue to the company by an amount considerably less than the actual total increased cost of coal. The company continues also to carry the entire burden of the increased cost of all supplies other than coal, and of all increases in the cost of labor, which the schedule amendments and provisions herein referred to take no account of whatever."

The fuel rate adjustment clauses as filed November 28, 1917, were not designed to be effective as to the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company, but during the progress of the hearings in this case it was contended by the other industrial consumers that this was a discrimination in favor of that company, and the clause was subsequently made effective as to it.

The old form of fuel rate adjustment, effective April 1, 1917, as to Schedules T and T-2 only, had provided for the addition or deduction of .033c. (33/1000 cent) per k.w.h. for each 10 per cent. of increase or decrease from an assumed normal cost of \$2.70 per ton for coal. The new form of fuel rate adjustment was upon the same basis, but provided for the addition or reduction of 1/100 of a cent for each 3 per cent. of increase or decrease in the cost of coal. There were also some minor changes in the phraseology of the clause tending to clarify the same.

President Wagner, of the respondent company, when on the witness stand, explained that the basis of 3/100 of a cent per k.w.h. for each 3 per cent. of increase or decrease from the normal cost of \$2.70 per ton, as provided in the revised clause effective January 1, 1918, was arrived at by dividing the \$2.70 assumed normal cost of a ton of coal by 2240 (pounds per long ton), thereby obtaining 1.205 mills (assumed 1.21) as the cost of one pound of coal. The experience of the company had shown that it required 2.73 pounds of coal to produce one k.w.h. of electrical energy sold. Hence the fuel cost of one k.w.h. of electrical energy, on the basis of coal at \$2.70 per long ton, was 3.30 mills (2.73x1.21). Consequently, a 3 per cent. increase in the cost of coal over \$2.70 per long ton would result in an increased fuel cost of .099 mills (3 per cent. of 3.30 mills) per k.w.h. This amount, .099 mills, is equivalent to 99/10,000 of one cent, and, for convenience in computation, was assumed to be 1/100 of one cent. Hence the above factor.

Assuming the correctness of all the figures used in the above calculations, it will be seen that the fuel rate adjustment proposed by the respondent company was admirably adapted to bring about changes in the industrial rates which would vary directly with increases or decreases in the actual cost of coal.

But, as was brought out first in the Hess case, and subsequently in greater detail in the case now before us, such adjustment was predicated upon the assumption that all the electrical energy furnished the industrial consumers was steam-generated, whereas, in fact, a large percentage of the same was hydro-electric energy purchased by the respondent company from the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company under a long-term contract at 4 mills per k.w.h., a price considerably lower than the cost of steam-generated current.

The records of the company showed the relative amounts so produced as follows:

TABLE XI

	<i>Hydro</i>	<i>Steam</i>
Year ended June 30, 1917.....	59%	41%
December, 1917.....	25%	75%
January, 1918.....	25.5%	74.5%
February, 1918.....	43%	57%
Year ending June 30, 1918 (est.).....	45%	55%

The company endeavored to meet these facts by the contention that under all the circumstances, some of which will hereinafter be referred to, it was but fair to give the smaller electrical consumers the benefit of the saving effected through the use of the hydro-electric energy and assume that all the electricity used by the industrial consumers was steam-generated.

By this contention the company virtually conceded that the so-called "fuel-rate-adjustment" clause was not in fact wholly an adjustment to provide against further increases in coal costs, and subsequently in the testimony, as well as in the oral argument and brief of its counsel, sought to justify it upon the ground that at most it would result in throwing upon the industrial consumers only such portion of additional costs of operations due to war conditions as they should properly bear.

It was further contended by the company in this connection that experience had shown that the cost of coal varies more directly with the cost of labor and other items of expense which enter into the cost of furnishing electrical current than any other single item, and that consequently variations in the cost of current based upon variations in the cost of coal would be as fair to both parties as would a composite figure based upon the varying costs of all items of expense, and would be much more simple in application. It was further contended that this was particularly true in the case of large power consumers, where the cost of coal formed such a large proportion of the total cost of production.

In the argument and brief of counsel for the respondent company the Commission was referred to cases in other States bearing upon the propriety of fuel adjustments in rate-making cases. In the case of the Public Service Electric Company of New Jersey the Commission of that State approved a somewhat similar coal clause or fuel rate adjustment applicable to industrial consumers (P. U. R. 1918-B, 857, 864-5), although in an earlier case (P. U. R. 1917-F, 205, 207-8) it had refused to approve such a clause as applicable as well to small consumers on the ground that "the additional cost of service due to increases in coal cost is not proportional to the rate charged, but is proportional to the fuel portion of that cost." In its opinion in the Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light Company case, the Wisconsin Commission (P. U. R. 1918-A, 798, 819) drew the above distinction, stating: "As to the smaller consumer, the cost of coal represents a relatively small per cent. of the total cost of the service, while as to the large consumer it represents a relatively large part."

On the part of the industrial consumers, it was contended by their counsel that the term "fuel rate adjustment" was a misnomer if it was intended to apply to other items of expense as well, some of which might vary independently of the cost of coal.

It is clear, from what we have stated above, that the fuel-rate-adjustment clause provides for considerably more than the mere cost of adjusting in the rates the varying costs of fuel, and that its real effect is to bring about a readjustment of the entire burden of the cost of service as between the respondent company's industrial electrical consumers on the one hand and its domestic and smaller commercial electrical consumers on the other. To that extent, therefore, the term itself may be a misnomer, and the clause might be more accurately defined as providing for a war-cost adjustment, to be based, in the case of the industrial consumers, upon the cost of fuel as the most practical index of such war costs in their particular case. But if the principle is sound, the fact that such principle has been designated by a more or less inappropriate name is no good reason for refusing to recognize the soundness of the principle itself. The conclusion of the Commission upon this point is that the principle of varying the charges to the industrial electrical consumers with the average cost of coal during the preceding month, rather than with the average variations in operating costs of all kinds, is a sound principle as applied to the conditions under which the respondent company is operating, despite the fact that the cost of a considerable proportion of its entire electrical output is hydro-generated, not dependent upon the cost of coal.

The chief contentions, however, of counsel for the industrial consumers with respect to the fuel-rate-adjustment clause were:

First, that the base price of \$2.70 adopted by the company in this clause as the normal cost of coal was entirely too low, inasmuch as the average cost of coal during the year 1917, the year of the company's greatest prosperity, was \$3.38 per ton, and \$2.70 was far lower than the average price of coal since 1914; and

Second, that adjustments of price upon the basis of coal at \$2.70 per ton and the rate per k.w.h. specified in the fuel-rate-adjustment clause would result in yielding the company a far greater amount of revenue than was necessary to recoup its additional expenses of operation due to war conditions.

In undertaking to adjust the price of electrical energy to the industrial consumers upon the basis of variations in the cost of fuel, some figure had to be taken as the normal cost of coal, and the company adopted the round figure, \$2.70. It was probably guided largely in this by the actual average cost of boiler coal prior to the world war in Europe, which Exhibit Wagner No. 24 shows were \$2.629 in 1912, \$2.626 in 1913, and \$2.667 in 1914. These figures were possibly modified somewhat in the light of coal costs of \$2.761 in 1915, \$2.739 in 1916, and \$3.384 in 1917. The evidence clearly shows that for many years prior to the beginning of the war in Europe the cost of coal to

the company had been practically constant, and was at or about \$2.70. With the beginning of the war came a rapid increase in fuel costs, which was not felt by the company until its fiscal year 1917, for the reason that it was receiving much of its coal under contracts at the old price. Meanwhile the industrial rates had been formulated upon the basis of the fuel costs which obtained when they were made, and it was not until after the war was more than two years under way, and the company foresaw the necessity of raising its industrial rates in order to have them keep pace with the rapidly growing cost of coal, that it adopted its original fuel-rate-adjustment clause. Under these circumstances it was but reasonable for the company to adopt \$2.70 as the normal cost of coal in making a comparison with the cost of coal under war conditions. The \$3.38 average price of coal during the year 1917 was in no sense a normal price of coal. It was simply an average of all the prices paid by the company during that year, some of which prices were the normal prices and others the war prices of that year.

The second contention of counsel above referred to is of much greater moment. It raises the clear question of whether or not the company actually requires the amount of revenue which will be yielded by the fuel-rate-adjustment clause and other changes in its schedules in order to recoup the industrial consumers' share of the company's additional expense of all kinds due to war conditions.

Exhibit Wagner No. 75 shows the company's estimates of its receipts from the fuel rate adjustment if applied to the Copper Company and all other industrial consumers for the six months ended June 30, 1918, on the basis of two months actual and four months estimated to have been \$414,627.71.

We will assume for the moment, in view of the lower rates already enjoyed by the industrial electrical consumers as compared with those paid by the smaller electrical consumers, and the relatively greater importance of fuel cost in the case of the former, that the entire burden of such additional costs, in so far as they relate to the electrical branch of the business, should be borne by the industrial consumers. We have seen that the original rates to the industrial consumers ranged from approximately one-half to one cent and upwards per kilowatt hour, while the rates to the domestic and smaller consumers ranged downward from eight cents to approximately two cents per kilowatt hour, the great bulk in number of such consumers paying the eight-cent rate. The extent of this differential in favor of the industrial consumers is further demonstrated by Exhibit Wagner No. 73, which shows that during the year ended June 30, 1918, the industrial consumers took 83 per cent. of the entire electrical output, while the remaining electrical consumers took but 16.1 per cent. of such output. Table II in this opinion shows that the domestic and smaller commercial consumers during 1917 paid \$2,356,116 for the relatively small amount of current consumed by them, while the industrial consumers,

who took the great bulk of the company's output, paid in that year but \$1,887,984 for the same.

Exhibit Wagner No. 32, as revised at the request of the Commission to show actual receipts, less fuel adjustments, for the last six months of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, shows a book deficit for those six months of \$430,376, subject to a reduction of \$159,795 on account of the inability of the company to procure a sufficient quantity of oil necessary to maintain the heating standard of gas prescribed by order of this Commission, thus reducing such book deficit to \$270,581. This was the book deficit from the entire business, both gas and electric, on the theory of no fuel-rate-adjustment charges having been made (Company's brief, pp. 21-2), and was arrived at after deducting from net earnings all fixed charges, the full appropriations to depreciation reserves, \$133,209 as a reserve for contingencies, and dividends at the rate of 8 per cent. per annum upon nearly fifteen millions of dollars of common stock. The deficit of \$270,581, in short, represented the company's own idea of the amount which it should have received during these six months to make it whole so far as additional war costs were concerned in connection with both branches of its business.

And yet, as we have seen, Exhibit Wagner No. 75 shows that the fuel rate adjustment alone, if applied to the Copper Company and all other industrial electrical consumers during these six months, would have yielded \$414,627.71, or \$144,046.71 more than the company's own estimates of its actual requirements for all purposes, and over its entire business, during that period.

Passing to the year ending June 30, 1919, we must enter a realm which is largely one of conjecture, based upon estimates. In this instance we have two separate sets of exhibits, containing such estimates, Exhibits Wagner Nos. 32 and 76, as originally filed and as revised.

The original Exhibit Wagner No. 32 was filed at the hearing on April 11, 1918, Exhibit No. 76 having been filed at the hearing on May 7, 1918. Mr. Wagner was examined by counsel upon these exhibits, and they were referred to at some length in the briefs and oral arguments of such counsel. Incidentally, No. 32 was accompanied by some twenty supporting exhibits.

The revised Exhibits Nos. 32 and 76 were sent to the Commission by the company in response to the Commission's request for the actual figures for the entire year ended June 30, 1918, in order that comparisons might be made with certain of the company's estimates in the original exhibits. These revised exhibits were not filed until July 27, 1918, which was nearly two months after the arguments in the case were concluded. Counsel for the industrial consumers consequently have never had an opportunity to examine the company's witnesses upon these exhibits, and for that reason, if for no other, they could not properly be used as the basis of a final decision in this case. Nevertheless, they will be used for purposes of illustration.

We will first consider the exhibits as originally filed.

Original Exhibits Nos. 32 and 76

Exhibit Wagner No. 32 as originally filed shows an estimated book deficit of \$2,108,493 for the year ending June 30, 1919, on the basis of no fuel rate adjustment and no increase in the rates for gas. This deficit is apparently based upon the assumption that oil will be purchased in sufficient quantities to maintain the heating standard of 600 B. T. U. prescribed by order of this Commission. There being no ground for this assumption in the light of recent developments, it is reasonable to assume that the estimated operating expense for this year will be reduced at least to the same extent on this account as they were during the year 1918, to wit: \$71,369, thus reducing the above book deficit to \$2,035,124. Revised Exhibit No. 32 shows the saving on the above account to have been \$176,717.20 during the year ended June 30, 1918, which, if assumed as to the saving in 1919, would reduce such deficit for 1919 to \$1,929,776. This deficit is arrived at in the same way as was the deficit for 1918, which we have above discussed, and represents the company's ideas of the full amount needed to meet all its corporate requirements.

Exhibit Wagner No. 76 shows estimated receipts for the year 1919 from the fuel rate adjustment to be \$1,531,488.72, and from the company's proposed increases in the prices for gas, \$749,688.96, a total of \$2,281,177.68, or \$351,401.68 more than necessary to meet all the company's corporate requirements, including the added costs due to war conditions on the basis of the figures in the preceding paragraph.

Revised Exhibits Nos. 32 and 76

Revised Exhibit No. 32 shows an estimated book deficit of \$2,520,012 for the year ending June 30, 1919, on the several bases above stated. Deducting \$176,717.20 from the cost of oil as above reduces this deficit to \$2,343,295.

Revised Exhibit No. 76 shows estimated receipts for the year 1919 from the fuel rate adjustment of \$1,660,483.43, and from the proposed increases in the prices for gas of \$763,708.35, a total of \$2,424,191.78, or approximately \$80,000 more than the amount necessary to meet all the company's corporate requirements as above stated.

It is but fair to the company to say that the principal reason for the wide discrepancy between its original and revised estimates above referred to, lies in the fact, as stated in its letter of July 27, 1918, accompanying such revised estimates, that the later estimates contain an allowance for increased costs of labor amounting to \$418,000 per year, based on wage increases planned to be put in effect within the next six weeks.

Conclusions as to Fuel Rate Adjustment

Counsel for the industrial consumers pointed out in their arguments and briefs the above and other errors and discrepancies in many of

the company's estimates of probable receipts and expenses of operation. But these demonstrated errors and discrepancies only prove how unsafe it would be to base rates in war times upon prognostications as to the future, no matter how carefully such prognostications may be made, and no matter how well they may seem to be supported by evidence and the opinions of competent experts thoroughly familiar with operating problems.

And this is exactly what the respondent company did not undertake to do in formulating its fuel-rate-adjustment clause. All the above estimates were designed to do, was to show with as reasonable a degree of accuracy as possible what the general effect of the fuel rate adjustment and other proposed changes in the schedules would be upon the net earnings of the company under war conditions.

But the fuel-rate-adjustment clause was not adopted with the idea of raising any specific sum which might be considered necessary to supplement a prospective shortage in net earnings from all causes, as is the case where schedules as a whole are increased.

In looking over the entire field of its operations the company saw one specific item of a rapidly increasing expense which, if not distributed equitably in some way among the consumers directly benefited by such expense, would speedily and inevitably result in such a shortage in the company's net earnings from operation as to make it impossible for it to continue to render adequate service to the public. That item was fuel coal used so largely in the production of electrical current. A large proportion of this coal was used directly for the benefit of the industrial consumers, and its cost formed a large percentage of the cost of rendering that particular service. Hence the fuel-rate-adjustment clause, applicable only to the industrial consumers and other large consumers of that particular class.

This adjustment, as we have seen, was originally designed to reimburse the company only for the additional cost of coal due to war conditions, but subsequently was found to cover other additional war costs as well, by reason of the fact that a large part of the current furnished the industrial consumers was hydro-generated, in the price of which the cost of coal has no part.

We have seen that on the basis of 1918 actual figures, the yield from such fuel rate adjustment in combination with other factors, including the growth of the company's business and economies in operation, would have been in excess of the company's own estimates of its actual requirements. What the result of these several factors will be during the coming year is, and under the circumstances, must be, largely a matter of conjecture.

But meanwhile the propriety of the fuel rate adjustment is in no sense dependent upon the accuracy of the company's forecasts as to the future. Those forecasts may or may not turn out to be entirely wrong. The deficits may, by reason of changes in other factors than that of fuel coal, turn out to be much larger or much smaller than the company now anticipates. If it should happen that by reason of

all circumstances combined, the company's net earnings as a whole are greater than they should properly be, the remedy would lie in reductions of the schedules as a whole, not necessarily in reductions of the industrial rates alone. Or if, on the other hand, the earnings as a whole turn out to be less than they should properly be, the remedy would lie in increasing the yield of the schedules as a whole, and it might be that in such a case a proper distribution of the burden of cost would require increases in the base rates of the industrial schedules, as distinguished from the fuel rate adjustment as such.

But the fuel rate adjustment itself can, by its very terms, at most yield the company no more than the actual additional fuel cost which would be incurred in generating the amount of electrical current actually used by the industrial consumers if the whole of that current were generated by the use of steam and no part of it by water-power.

If we assume for the moment that the fuel rate adjustment would yield no more than the actual increase in the cost of coal used in generating the current actually received by the industrial consumers, then the adjustment would certainly be fair to all concerned, when we realize that the industrial consumers got their original preferential rates largely upon the assumption that the cost of coal would continue to remain at or about \$2.70.

Therefore, the only question is whether or not it is reasonable to require the industrial consumers to pay, in the form of the fuel rate adjustment, other additional costs of operation due to war conditions, which other additional costs were no more anticipated when the industrial rates were originally established than was the greatly enhanced cost of fuel coal.

The company's Exhibits Nos. 74 and 30 show that by reason mainly of certain extremely large orders from the War Department, the amount of sales not subject to the fuel rate adjustment during the year ending June 30, 1919, will be reduced to 9.9 per cent. of its total output, while the hydro-electric current will be reduced to 26.96 per cent. of its total current generated and purchased, and 17.06 per cent. of the amount actually sold.

The evidence shows that the excess of sales of hydro-electric energy over sales not subject to the fuel rate adjustment is 96,538,095 k.w.h., which, on the basis of the 1919 estimated fuel rate adjustment of 3 mills per k.w.h., would mean \$289,614, which the industrial consumers would so have to pay. The company contends that this difference is more than made up in the additional cost of labor alone since 1916. If, in addition, there are still further increases in labor costs during the year 1919, which would seem to be not improbable, it will be seen that the Company's contention upon this point is well within reason.

But even apart from these considerations, the evidence bearing upon which is imperfect at this stage of the case, this Commission is of the opinion that it would not be unreasonable, under all the circumstances, to require the industrial consumers to bear the whole additional cost of coal used in the electrical branch of the Company's business, if such

added burden would not result in rates to such industrial consumers in excess of the fair worth of the service.

We have seen that the industrial schedules originally filed provided for rates ranging from 4.5 mills up to 4½ cents per k.w.h. The primary rate charged the domestic consumers was 8c. per k.w.h., and in the case of smaller commercial consumers ranged down to 2 cents per k.w.h. But both the domestic and commercial consumers taking current under Schedule B are obliged to pay for certain amounts of their current at the 8-cent rate.

The fuel rate adjustment at the price of coal at the date of the hearings resulted in an increase of 3 mills per k.w.h. to the industrial consumers. Even so the price to many of the largest industrial users would range but from 4.8 mills to 1.3 cents per k.w.h. as against the 8 cents per k.w.h. paid by the bulk of the smaller consumers.

The industrial consumers make a special use of the current furnished them, and the cost of such current goes into the cost and consequent price of their product, whatever that may be. If they did not use the current furnished by the respondent Company, they would probably generate their own current, or seek an equivalent substitute, in which event they would certainly have to bear the prevailing increased costs of coal, labor and materials. In taking the current from the respondent Company they still get the benefit of the economies in operation which have been perfected in its organization, and even at the increased cost due to the fuel rate adjustment are getting the commodity at less than its actual worth to them under the circumstances, and at a cost very little, if at all, in excess of the actual cost to the Company of furnishing the same, counting in that cost a reasonable return upon the proportion of the entire property dedicated to their use.

The domestic consumers, on the other hand, are wholly dependent upon the respondent Company for the service furnished them. In their case, equivalent substitutes are not to be had upon any terms within reason. They are, moreover, already burdened by the higher costs of living due to war conditions, and are not in a position to commercialize this particular burden. The equity of these considerations was recognized by nearly all the counsel who argued the case for the industrial consumers, and only one of such counsel contended that the domestic and small commercial consumers should bear any part of the increased cost of coal.

Nor can it well be objected that such a distribution of the burden of cost among the industrial consumers on the one hand and the Schedule B customers on the other would result in unlawful discrimination as against the former.

Discrimination in the matter of rates is not made by law a matter of terms or of cents per kilowatt hour. To be unlawful it must be unjust or unreasonable; and there is no inherent injustice in declaring that an industrial consumer who commercializes the product of a public utility should not be permitted as great a differential over the

domestic consumer in war times as he enjoyed before the war, when such industrial consumer by reason of the war is in a position to commercialize such product to even greater advantage than before.

Again, while the courts have declared that the proprietors of a public utility are entitled to receive through their schedule as a whole a fair and reasonable return for their service, based primarily upon the value of the property used and useful therein, they have never declared that particular rates shall be based with mathematical precision upon the cost of service as so determined. The most they have ever declared in the case of particular rates is that the proprietors of the utility may not lawfully be required by the State to furnish a service for less than proper compensation, or virtually at merely operating cost, regardless of the amount of the investment dedicated to that particular service.

Northern Pac. Ry. Co. vs. N. Dakota (1915), 226 U. S. 585.
Penn. R. R. Co. vs. P. S. C. of Md., 126 Md. 59

The old criterion that a rate shall never be in excess of the actual worth of the service to the consumer has never been changed, and would seem to afford ample justification for the alternative proposition that a rate may be lawful which is based mainly upon the worth of the service. It is the conclusion of this Commission, upon all the facts in the case, that the rates which will be charged the industrial consumers under the schedules effective January 1, 1918, and July 1, 1918 (in the case of the Copper Co.), are not in excess of the fair worth of the service to such consumer.

Moreover the evidence in this case indicates that certain of the original industrial rates were barely compensatory at the time they were put in force, and were adopted largely with the view of increasing and establishing the Company's business, and in the hope of thereby enabling the Company to diminish the general burden of cost to all its consumers. The evidence further shows that with the increase in fuel and other costs due to war conditions, some of these rates long since became non-compensatory. Even with the added fuel rate adjustment there is some question, under the evidence before us, whether some of these industrial rates will be compensatory to the extent that they should be, due regard being had to the fact that other classes of the Company's patrons should not be required to bear an undue proportion of the cost of the service as a whole, if to do so would result in their paying more than the fair worth of the service to them.

Some of the principles which we have above expressed have been recognized by other Commissions in dealing with increases in rates made effective because of war conditions. We have already referred in this opinion to several of these cases decided by the New Jersey and Wisconsin Commissions. In addition, the Indiana Commission has approved rate increases in the case of industrial consumers where

smaller consumers were exempted from such increases. (See P. U. R. 1917 F. 23, and 1918 C, 479, 488.)

In the latter case, decided March 25, 1918, the Indiana Commission said:

"The Public Service Commission, furthermore, with a few exceptions, in giving relief that was needed, has been able to keep the burden from falling on the great mass of consumers already burdened to the limit of their abilities. This has generally been accomplished by increases in power rates. These rates, as a rule, are very low, and are generally enjoyed only by the large consumers who, as a rule, are able to spread the burden out over the broad field of war price sale of their commodities. Many of these also enjoy war contracts."

Ft. Wayne and N. I. Traction Co. vs. Ft. Wayne P. U. R.
1918-C, 479, 488.

For the reasons hereinbefore stated, this Commission is of the opinion that the fuel-rate-adjustment clause contained in the Company's schedules effective January 1, 1918, is substantially just and reasonable, and the same will therefore be approved by our order passed pursuant to this opinion. This ruling applies as well to Schedule R, effective July 1, 1918.

OTHER CLAUSES IN CONTRACTS FOR INDUSTRIAL SERVICE

It was contended in the argument and brief of counsel for the Baltimore Dry Docks and Shipbuilding Company that if the contracts with the industrial consumers be in effect modified by the order of this Commission in the above most important particular, to wit: the price to be charged and paid for the commodity agreed to be furnished, then the Company should not be permitted to make future term contracts for service, since such future contracts would lack that element of mutuality which is essential to all contracts relating to future events. But this does not necessarily follow. There is no prohibition in law against the making of a contract subject to a future condition. Such contracts are made every day in ordinary business life, and their validity as contracts is universally recognized by the courts. Large business, especially in war times, would be almost impossible in the absence of the right so to contract.

As between individuals among themselves, and as between individuals and strictly private corporations, such conditions may be even made dependent upon the will, judgment or determination of one or the other of the contracting parties. But in the case of a public service corporation furnishing the necessities of life, and enjoying the benefits of a monopoly in that service, there are good reasons why

conditions of this latter class should not be imposed unless expressly authorized or permitted by law as a matter of legislative policy.

But aside from these considerations, Section 37 of the Public Service Commission Law expressly provides, that after an investigation and lawful order of this Commission fixing and determining the maximum price of gas and electricity to be charged for (any class of) such service:

“The price so fixed by the Commission shall be the maximum price to be charged by such person or corporation for gas or electricity in such municipality or county until the Commission shall, upon complaint, as provided in this section, or by the corporation interested, or upon its application for a new adjustment of rates or upon an investigation conducted by the Commission of its own motion, again fix the maximum price according to law of such gas or electricity.”

In the recent past the respondent Company has used in its contracts and rules a variety of clauses designed to indicate to its customers the possibility of changes in the rates therein prescribed by order of or with the approval of the Public Service Commission.

Thus in Supplement No. 21 to P. S. C. Md. E-4, filed November 28, 1917, effective on and after January 1, 1918, “on all service supplied,” there appears this clause:

“All contracts are taken subject to changes in or revisions of rates or conditions as they may be approved by the Public Service Commission from time to time.”

In Supplement No. 23 to the same schedule, filed November 28, 1917, likewise effective on all service supplied, appears the following clause:

“9. The prices herein specified and the terms and conditions in connection therewith are subject to change at any time by order of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, or to accord with changes in standard rates filed with the said Commission.”

In Schedule R, Supplement No. 28, filed June 28, 1918, designed to embrace the special class of service furnished the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company and made effective on July 1, 1918, by special order of the Commission, this clause in Supplement No. 23 was used rather than the clause in the later Supplement No. 27.

In neither event does the clause as used comply with the views of the Commission as hereinbefore expressed. The clause, particularly in the latter instance, carries the implication that the contract rates may be changed at any time by the Company of its own initiative, and upon the mere filing of a new rate to become effective without the

prior approval of this Commission. For the reasons hereinbefore stated, it is not the Commission's intention that this shall hereafter be done. The Commission is about to prescribe maximum rates for all these classes of service, and, this being done, under Section 37 of the Public Service Commission Law above quoted, the prices so fixed by the Commission become the maximum prices to be charged for such classes of service until some other maximum prices may be lawfully fixed by the Commission.

Consequently this clause should be made to read:

"All contracts are taken subject to changes in or revisions of rates or conditions as they may be lawfully prescribed by the Public Service Commission from time to time."

This provision should be made uniform as to all classes of service for which the Company requires contracts.

The respondent Company states that the reason for requiring five-year contracts in the case of certain of its schedules, three-year contracts in the case of others, and one-year contracts in the case of others, is to provide for *permanent power service*, and contends that such permanence of service is part of the consideration for which the power customer so contracting receives a lower rate than that charged smaller consumers who are not required so to contract, either with respect to the amount of consumption or as to the length of term.

There was considerable evidence in the case upon this question, and the Commission has concluded that the respondent Company should be permitted to make such term contracts for service, subject, however, to the conditions hereinafter set forth.

Term of Contract.

The respondent Company's present schedules here in controversy each provide for a specific term, varying with the respective classes of service. These respective terms of service are approved, subject to the condition that the appropriate term shall be used in all cases where such class of service is hereafter contracted for, and that there shall be no discrimination among customers within any given class of service.

In the case of existing contracts entered into before April 15, 1917, when the "fuel-rate-adjustment" clause was added to certain of the schedules, an exception will be made to the extent that such contracts shall be renewed, if desired by the customer, for the remainder of the term or terms originally prescribed, subject to the modifications in the form and substance of such contracts which will result from the orders of this Commission about to be made pursuant to the views expressed in this opinion. The Public Service Commission Law does not prohibit *all* discriminations between the patrons of a gas or electrical company. It only prohibits such discrimination as may be undue or unreasonable,

and in the opinion of this Commission, no such undue or unreasonable discrimination will arise by the above concession to the present holders of these contracts. Such holders of contracts cannot be required by the order of this Commission to continue the same under the changed conditions about to be made by our order, but it is to the interest of the public that they do so, and if it is found to be to their own interest as well, no technical objection should be raised to dissuade them.

"Non-Peak Service Provisions"

Certain of the Company's older schedules made provisions for preferential rates in the case of installations in which the load was considerably less between the hours of 4 P. M. and 8 P. M. during the period from November 1 to January 31, inclusive, each year, than at other times. This preferential rate was given to encourage the production of a higher load factor and the use of power at times other than during the hours of peak demand on the Company's system. When these provisions were originally made the load on the Company's system was considerably higher between the hours of 4 P. M. and 8 P. M. than at other periods of the day or night, by reason largely of the increased demands of domestic service between those hours. More recently the industrial demand has grown proportionately much greater than the other demands which formerly resulted in the peak load during the above hours, and it has been found, according to the evidence, that customers are now generally ignoring the non-peak requirements, and are not restricting their use of power during the fixed hours, with the result that the periods between the hours stated in the schedules are no longer the periods during which the peak of the Company's generating and distributing systems occur, resulting in peak loads shifting from day to day from 11 o'clock in the morning to 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

For these reasons the Company, by its Supplements Nos. 19, 20, etc., filed November 28, 1917, effective on and after January 1, 1918, withdrew these provisions from its schedules containing the same.

The Commission is satisfied from the evidence that the withdrawal of these provisions was reasonable on the part of the Company, and that their continuance would result in preferential rates to the present holders of contracts containing such provisions, which preferential rates would not be justified by the circumstances as they now exist.

Methods of Determining Demand for Large Installations

Somewhat akin to the above provisions are the provisions in the Company's industrial schedules providing methods of determining the demand for large installations.

There is considerable evidence in the record on this subject, counsel for certain of the industrial consumers having objected to the Company's rule on this subject on the ground that it was not fair to the

consumer. The evidence satisfies the Commission that the rule is substantially fair as it stands, but could be modified to advantage by the insertion of the words "in which case the 'peak load' shall be taken as the average fluctuation in one hour" at the end thereof.

Harmonizing Features of Revised Schedules

This is the third sub-division of the changes effected by the supplemental schedules of the respondent Company which became effective on January 1, 1918. In a letter of President Wagner addressed to the Commission on November 28, 1917, accompanying the filing of the supplements effecting the rate changes which have resulted in the present proceedings, the following explanation of the so-called "harmonizing" feature is advanced:

"Amendments to Schedule S-2 on account of some discrepancies found to exist between the said schedule and Schedule S, which are not in harmony with the introductory statement under Schedule S-2 giving the information that 'This schedule will give substantially the same results as Schedule S.' Schedule S-2 is intended to be simply another form of billing for service in accordance with the base Schedule S."

"Amendments to Schedule T-2 and Schedule T to make them conform more closely to statement at the heading of Schedule T-2, giving the information that 'This schedule will give substantially the same results as Schedule T.'"

"The rates under Schedule S are not altered. The rates under Schedule T are not altered, except that the last step in the schedule is lowered."

This letter also states that "The foregoing amendments, with the possible exception of the abandonment of non-peak service, will not change rates substantially, nor produce a substantial change in the Company's revenue."

Schedules S and S-2 both publish industrial rates for general service, each of these schedules providing that:

"Electricity for power or equivalent use in specified location will be sold under this schedule to any customer who has signed an agreement for Permanent Electric Service for a term of at least three years, embodying the Terms and Conditions of the Company."

Schedule S provides certain fixed costs, decreasing in blocks as the demand increases, plus running costs, which costs likewise decrease per unit as the consumption increases. The fixed costs are made to apply per kilowatt of demand, and the running cost per kilowatt hour for electricity consumed. The distinguishing feature of Schedule S-2 is that the fixed charges thereunder include running costs up to certain

stated consumptions. For example, the fixed charges for twelve-hour service include running costs for 180 hours' use of the demand per month, the schedule stating that this is taken as 25 days, 12 hours per day, at 60 per cent. load factor. The fixed charges for 24-hour service include running costs for 430 hours' use of the demand per month, this use being predicated upon 30 days, 24 hours per day, at 60 per cent. load factor. Should the consumption in any month fall short of 180 hours' use of the rated demand, in case of 12 hours' service, or 430 hours in the case of 24-hour service, the customer is given a rebate on such shortage and where the use is in excess of the amount allowed, the excess consumption is charged for the rebate and the charge for excess being at the same rate per unit, depending upon the rated demand of the particular customer. For example, a customer whose demand is 100 kilowatts contracting for 24-hour service is entitled to use 43,000 kilowatt hours per month, or 100 kilowatt x 430 hours. Should the actual consumption either exceed or fall short of 43,000 kilowatt hours the excess or the shortage is charged for or credited, as the case may be, at rate of 1 cent per kilowatt hour. Under Schedule S the fixed costs do not include the charge for any electricity, all energy actually used being charged for at specified rates.

Schedules T and T-2 both provide industrial power rates for high-tension transmission line service. The caption at head of each of these schedules stipulates that:

"Electricity for large power, with incidental lighting, or for industrial or railroad uses, may be furnished under this schedule solely at the Company's option from its high-tension, alternating current transmission lines, if such current be available as decided by the Company, at specified location for demands of 200 kilowatts and over, and provided the customer has signed an agreement for permanent power service for a term of at least five years, embodying the terms and conditions of the Company."

"The Company shall have the option of supplying either 60-cycle or 25-cycle service under this schedule as it may have lines for this service available. The charges hereinafter scheduled are based upon 60-cycle service, and are subject to 10 per cent. discount where 25-cycle service is supplied."

As in the case of the S schedules, the T schedules are made up of fixed costs and running costs. The fixed charges under Schedule T-2 likewise include running costs up to the same point of consumption as do the fixed charges under Schedule S-2, with the same method of adjustment for excess consumption or shortage.

While Schedules S-2 and T-2 both provide rates for 12-hour service and 24-hour service, the terms "12-hour" and "24-hour" do not in themselves mean anything, the load factor of the particular customer

determining under which of these classes he will receive the more advantageous billing.

At the hearings the attitude of the Company, as expressed by its President and also by counsel, was to leave the settlement of this matter to the Commission, and very little testimony was offered in support thereof. Neither do any of the exhibits introduced by the respondent Company purporting to show the increase in the Company's gross revenues resulting from the changes take any account of the additional revenues which will accrue to the Company by reason of the harmonizing feature. It further appears that the respondent Company has not yet attempted to apply the "harmonizing" rates to customers receiving service under existing contracts, nor does it appear to be its intention to apply these rates to such customers, though how this can be done without creating discrimination in favor of these customers and against new customers does not appear, and in point of fact counsel for the Company frankly expressed his doubts upon this point.

Just how great the increase would be by reason of this feature is not shown of record, though in the case of the Hess Steel Company it was shown to be approximately \$19,000 per annum under two contracts which that Company holds, under one of which, however, service had not yet begun at the time hearings in this case were concluded.

In the course of the hearings it developed that all of the customers of the respondent under its T schedules were at that time being billed under Schedule T-2. That is to say, in order to harmonize Schedules T and T-2 the Company increased the rates in certain blocks in Schedule T-2, the active schedule, so as to make the charges under same more closely approximate those under the inactive Schedule T, the only change in this last schedule being that the consumption charge in the final block of this schedule is reduced, which reduction is hereby approved.

Likewise, the co-ordination of Schedules S and S-2 is effected by increasing the charges under Schedule S when necessary to produce the desired harmony. It appears that the majority of customers receiving service under these two schedules are billed under Schedule S.

The reason for having two schedules publishing rates in different forms for the same class of service is given by President Wagner as follows:

"The idea of adopting Schedule T-2 was to obviate confusion. We found that Schedule T required a great deal of explanation. The customers wanted to know: 'I see you can figure it out, but what I want to know is how much I am going to pay per month? I would like a flat price—like to know just what my bills are going to be; I don't want the rate per kilowatt hour; I don't want a sliding scale; I want to know as nearly as I can when I have a thousand horsepower, what it is going to cost me a month to operate that thousand horse-

power.' Schedule T-2 attempts to state that, and states it as simply as it can be stated."

"The only good of the T schedule now is that some people yet prefer that form and that it shows the basis for the Schedule T-2, which in itself shows no logical basis for the rate."

The disparity between these schedules has existed for some time (just how long does not appear of record), and the only effect seems to have been to attract the T users to Schedule T-2. In the light of the facts submitted the Commission finds that the Company has failed to justify the reasonableness of and the necessity for the increases in Schedules S-2 and T-2.

By this the Commission is not to be taken as disapproving the plan of the respondent Company to bring these schedules more closely together, but its conclusion is that such co-ordination should not be effected at the expense of the Company's patrons, but rather that the desired result be attained through changes in Schedules S and T.

An order will be passed in accordance with the foregoing conclusions.

ORDER No. 4452.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, in Respect to the Fairness and Reason- ableness of Certain Industrial Power Rates.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1492.</p>
---	---	---

In accordance with the views expressed in the foregoing opinion, and for the reasons therein stated, it is, this ninth day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the fuel-rate-adjustment clause contained in the schedule and supplements to schedules of the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company filed with this Commission November 28, 1917, to become effective January 1, 1918, and the fuel-rate-adjustment clause in the said Company's Schedule R, filed June 28, 1918, to become effective July 1, 1918, be and the same are hereby approved, to remain effective for the period of two years from the date of this

order, unless earlier modified or abrogated by the further order of this Commission;

2. That all clauses in any of the said Company's contracts or schedules of rates for electrical service which expressly or by implication provide for any changes in the rates therein prescribed by the mere filing of new or revised schedules by said Company without the express approval of this Commission are hereby disapproved, and, in lieu thereof, said Company shall file with this Commission a supplementary schedule or regulation, effective as to all electrical patrons, containing a clause as follows:

"All contracts are taken subject to changes in or revisions of rates or conditions as they may be lawfully prescribed by the Public Service Commission from time to time."

3. That the changes in the said Company's schedules filed November 28, 1917, to become effective January 1, 1918, designed to abolish the preferential rates previously charged in the case of electrical installations in which the load was less between the hours of 4 P. M. and 8 P. M: during the period from November 1 to January 31, inclusive, each year, than at other times, be and the same are hereby approved.

4. That the regulation contained in said Company's Exhibit 2, Electric Rate Schedules, revised to January 1, 1918, entitled "Methods of Determining Demand for Large Installations," is unreasonable as filed and should be revised to read as follows:

"In determining the demand as provided under the various schedules for large installations, the Company may install an instrument to continuously record the customer's maximum load, and the demand shall be determined by selecting the highest five of the customer's maximum peak loads occurring at any time of the day or night during the month and omitting the highest and lowest of these readings, and averaging the three remaining readings, which average shall constitute the demand. In determining the demand the term 'peak load' shall be taken as equal to the maximum kilowatt hours registered by integrating watt hour or curve-drawing meter in one hour; except for rapidly fluctuating loads, in which case the 'peak load' shall be taken as the average fluctuation in one hour above the average load in the said hour."

The above change to be effective as to all schedules and contracts containing provisions identical with or substantially similar to the provisions of said Exhibit 2.

5. That the amendments to Schedules S, S-2, T and T-2 referred to in the concluding portion of the foregoing opinion entitled "Harmonizing Features of Revised Schedules," are unreasonable as filed and should be revised to correspond with the conclusions stated in said opinion, subject to the approval of this Commission when refiled.

6. That copies of this order be forthwith served upon all the counsel of record in this case, and that the respondent Company be required within twenty days from the receipt of said copy by its counsel of record to notify this Commission in writing whether the terms of this order are accepted and will be obeyed.

ORDER No. 4452.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE in Respect to the Fairness and Reason- ableness of Certain Industrial Power Rates.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1492.</p>
---	---	---

In accordance with the views expressed in the foregoing opinion, and for the reasons therein stated, it is this ninth day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the fuel-rate-adjustment clause contained in the schedule and supplements to schedules of the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company filed with this Commission November 28, 1917, to become effective January 1, 1918, and the fuel-rate-adjustment clause in the said Company's Schedule R filed June 28, 1918, to become effective July 1, 1918, be and the same are hereby approved, to remain effective for the period of two years from the date of this order, unless earlier modified or abrogated by the further order of this Commission;

2. That all clauses in any of the said Company's contracts or schedules of rates for electrical service which expressly or by implication provide for any changes in the rates therein prescribed by the mere filing of new or revised schedules by said Company without the express approval of this Commission are hereby disapproved, and, in lieu thereof, said Company shall file with this Commission a supplementary schedule or regulation, effective as to all electrical patrons, containing a clause as follows:

"All contracts are taken subject to changes in or revisions of rates or conditions as they may be lawfully prescribed by the Public Service Commission from time to time."

3. That the changes in the said Company's schedules filed November 28, 1917, to become effective January 1, 1918, designed to abolish the preferential rates previously charged in the case of electrical installations in which the load was less between the hours of 4 P. M. and 8 P. M. during the period from November 1 to January 31, inclusive, each year, than at other times, be and the same are hereby approved.

4. That the regulation contained in said Company's Exhibit 2, Electric Rate Schedules Revised to January 1, 1918, entitled, "Methods of Determining Demand for Large Installations," is unreasonable as filed, and should be revised to read as follows:

"In determining the demand as provided under the various schedules for large installations, the Company may install an instrument to continuously record the customer's maximum load, and the demand shall be determined by selecting the highest five of the customer's maximum peak loads occurring at any time of the day or night during the month and omitting the highest and lowest of these readings, and averaging the three remaining readings, which average shall constitute the demand. In determining the demand the term 'peak load' shall be taken as equal to the maximum kilowatt hours registered by integrating watt hour or curve-drawing meter in one hour; except for rapidly fluctuating loads, in which case the 'peak load' shall be taken as the average fluctuation in one hour,"

the above change to be effective as to all schedules and contracts containing provisions identical with or substantially similar to the provisions of said Exhibit 2.

5. That the amendments to Schedules S, S-2, T and T-2 referred to in the concluding portion of the foregoing opinion, entitled "Harmonizing Features of Revised Schedules," are unreasonable as filed and should be revised to correspond with the conclusions stated in said opinion, subject to the approval of this Commission when refiled.

6. That copies of this order be forthwith served upon all the counsel of record in this case, and that the respondent Company be required within twenty days from the receipt of said copy by its counsel of record to notify this Commission in writing whether the terms of this order are accepted and will be obeyed.

ORDER No. 4453.

<hr/> In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of THE HESS STEEL CORPORATION		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		
THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY		Case No. 1473.

In accordance with the views expressed in the opinion this day filed "In the Matter of the Complaint of the Public Service Commission of Maryland vs. The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, in Respect to the Fairness and Reasonableness of Certain Industrial Power Rates," Case No. 1492, and for the reasons therein stated, it is this 9th day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in this case be and the same is hereby dismissed, except to the extent that certain grounds of said complaint are declared to be reasonable in the order this day passed in said Case No. 1492.

ORDER No. 4457.

<hr/> In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE ELKTON WATER WORKS, INCORPORATED, for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exer- cise of Its Franchise and Rights Granted It by Its Certificate of Incor- poration and to Take Over the Fran- chise Heretofore Granted to the Mary- land Water Company of Cecil County by the Mayor and City Council of Elk- ton and to Operate Thereunder and for Authority to Issue \$30,000 of Its Capi- tal Stock.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1572.

WHEREAS, The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise of its franchise and rights granted it by its certificate of incorporation, certified copy of which certificate of incorporation is filed in these proceedings, and to take over the franchise heretofore granted to the

Maryland Water Company of Cecil County by the President and Town Commissioners of Elkton, and to operate thereunder, and for authority to issue \$30,000 par value of said company's common stock, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on August 7, 1918, after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4433 passed July 30, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the plans proposed by The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, would not satisfy existing conditions so far as the water supply of Elkton is concerned, and

WHEREAS, The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, having thereafter amended its certificate of incorporation and filed with the Commission an amended petition, a conference was had on Wednesday, August 21, 1918, at the office of the Commission, at which conference all interested parties were present, and as a result of the discussion at said conference the said supplemental petition was found to reasonably satisfy the conditions under consideration,

THEREFORE, In consideration of the foregoing statements, it is this 21st day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the exercise by The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, of the franchise and rights granted it by its certificate of incorporation and amendment thereto be, and it is hereby, permitted and approved.

2. That the purchase by said The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, of all of the property, rights and franchises of the Maryland Water Company of Cecil County from one James H. Alexander, the purchaser thereof at public auction, upon the terms and conditions set forth in the amended application herein, and the operation thereof and thereunder by said The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, be and the same are hereby permitted and approved.

3. That the issue by said The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, of \$5,250 par value of its preferred stock, and \$15,000 par value of its common capital stock to the said James H. Alexander in payment of the property, rights and franchises aforesaid, subject to prior liens, and the issue and sale of \$10,000 of its preferred stock at par for cash be and the same are hereby authorized and approved.

4. The proceeds from the sale of the \$10,000 of preferred stock to be used for the acquisition of property, the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its plant and distribution system, the improvement or maintenance of its service, and the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations, as set forth in said supplemental petition.

FURTHER Ordered, That The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, be and it is hereby directed and required:

(a) To lay a four-inch pipe in the bed of Davis Street from a connection with its main in Bridge Street easterly for a distance of one thousand feet, more or less, to Singerly Street, or, as an alternative plan to lay a four-inch pipe in the bed of Davis Street from a con-

nection with its main in North Street westerly to the west side of Singerly Street.

(b) To drive or dig such wells as are necessary to provide a safe and adequate supply of water.

(c) To forthwith make such repairs in the water distribution system of the applicant as are necessary in order to remedy the damage thereto and leaks therein resulting from the freezing of parts of said distribution system during the past winter.

(d) To install meters upon the services of the applicant as expeditiously as said meters can be obtained and installed.

(c) To employ an engineer to supervise the work by this Order required to be done, as well as such other or additional work which may be necessary in order to place the plant and system of the applicant in condition to furnish safe and adequate service, and to place some competent person in charge of the water works and distribution system of the applicant, who shall give constant attention to the affairs of the Company.

FURTHER ORDERED, That the said The Elkton Water Works, Incorporated, shall make reports, duly verified by affidavits, as follows:

(a) Upon the sale for cash of the preferred stock authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such sale or sales, the terms and conditions thereof and the amount realized therefrom, and of the payment to James H. Alexander of the \$5,250 of preferred stock and the \$15,000 of common stock as heretofore set forth in this Order.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this Order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said preferred stock, and the facts and circumstances as to the property acquired and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of the facilities hereby ordered, authorized and approved.

(c) At the termination of each and every month from the date of this Order, the progress made in the construction, maintenance and metering work by this Order required to be done, until such work shall have been completed.

ORDER No. 4463.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the Carriers Not Under Federal Control Named in the Official Classification by R. N. COLLYER, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Official Classification No. 44 P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 542.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 29th day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby, given carriers not under Federal control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their agent, to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, adding to said classification specifications for Army Field Kitchens or Army Field Kitchen Limbers as set forth in petition herein,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

“Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4463 of date August 29, 1918.

ORDER No. 4464.

In the Matter of

The Application of the Highways Transfer Company for an Order Permitting and Approving the Discontinuance of Its Motor Vehicle Freight Service Between the District of Columbia Line and Mechanicsville, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1576.

The above entitled application having been received and filed, and the Transportation Expert having been directed to investigate the matter and file his report thereon, which report was this day filed

herein, and the Commission after due consideration of application and report, being of the opinion, in view of the facts presented, that the application should be granted,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This thirtieth day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of the Highways Transfer Company to discontinue its service between the District of Columbia Line and Mechanicsville, Maryland, be, and the same is hereby, permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4465.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

vs.

THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT
AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, in
Respect to the Fairness and Reason-
ableness of Certain Industrial Power
Rates.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1492.

The above case having been decided August 9, 1918, and it appearing to the Commission that the regulation set forth and prescribed in Section 4 of said Order does not fully express the intention of the Commission in prescribing the same,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 30th day of August, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That Section 4 of said Order No. 4452 be and the same is hereby modified to the extent that the words "above the average load in the said hour" be inserted at the end of the regulation set forth in said Section 4, and be considered a part of said regulation as fully as if the same had been contained in said original Order No. 4452;

2. That in all other respects said Order No. 4452 is hereby confirmed;

3. That copies of this Order be forthwith served upon counsel of record in this case, and that the respondent Company be required within five (5) days from the receipt of said copy by its counsel of record to notify this Commission in writing whether the terms of this Order are accepted and will be obeyed.

OPINION.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of OSBORNE I. YELLOTT		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
THE BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY		Case No. 1573.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

LEGG, Commissioner.

August 19, 1918.

The complaint in this case was filed July 23, 1918, by Osborne I. Yellott, the Assistant General Counsel of this Commission, a patron of the respondent Company, residing at Towson, on his own behalf, and as well as on behalf of all the residents of Baltimore County similarly affected. The Complaint was to the effect that for several weeks prior to the date it was filed, there had been a serious shortage of the respondent's water supply at Towson, Lutherville and other portions of its Northern District, the complainant asking this Commission to make an immediate investigation for the purposes (1) of determining the cause or causes of such shortage, and (2) adopting such means as might be necessary to correct the same in future.

A copy of this Complaint was served upon the Company with the request that it file its answer forthwith.

On July 25 the Company filed its answer alleging that by reasons of delays in the final determination of its application for changes in its rates, and incidentally the valuation of its property, Case No. 375, it had been unable to finance the additions and enlargements to the plant and property necessary to enable it in all respects to keep pace with its increased patronage in certain portions of its Northern District, with the result that its lines in these sections had become somewhat overloaded; but that immediately upon the passage of the valuation order on July 6, 1917, the Company had taken steps to correct this situation by ordering a booster pump and undertaking to enlarge a section of its supply main near Towson, these two installations being designed to increase the delivery capacity of such supply main into the Aigburth reservoir and standpipe near Towson; that delivery of the booster pump equipment had been promised for November, 1917, and of the pipe for enlarging the mains during the winter of 1917-1918, but by reason of war conditions deliveries in both instances had been greatly delayed, with the result that such installations had not been completed at the date of the filing of such answer, although expected to be completed in the immediate future. The Company further

stated in its answer that in order to guard against interruptions in service to Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton in the future, it contemplated the construction in the near future of a new line from the Towson reservoir to Lutherville and Ruxton at a lower grade than the existing line; thus supplying Lutherville and Ruxton by gravity from such reservoir and leaving the standpipe at Aigburth for the exclusive use of the residents of Towson and its immediate vicinity.

On July 29 the complainant filed a reply to this answer, stating in effect that he was not satisfied that the steps proposed to be taken by the Company would meet the requirements of the situation, and asked for a hearing upon his complaint. The complainant also asked that the Commission's Engineering Department be required in the meantime to prepare a report covering the subject matter of his complaint. Such report of the Chief Engineer was filed August 8, 1918, and on the same day the complainant wrote the Commission that he was unable to determine from such report whether or not the troubles complained of by him would be permanently corrected by the steps which said report showed had been taken by the Company, and asked that his complaint be set for hearing not later than August 14.

On August 9 the Commission passed an order setting the Complaint for hearing on August 14, and directing that such hearing be held before the undersigned Commissioner as provided by Section 4 of the Public Service Commission Law.

Such hearing was held on August 14 and 15; a large amount of testimony was taken and numerous exhibits filed.

I shall not discuss this evidence at length, but will confine myself to a statement of the conclusions reached by me from the facts presented, and my recommendations in the premises. It will be noted that the Complaint involves only the Company's service to its patrons in a portion of the Northern District, and relates more especially to the service to Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton, the number of the Company's patrons in those localities forming about 5 per cent. of the Company's total number of patrons. No question has been raised by this complaint as to the Company's service in its Herring Run District, Western District or those portions of its Northern District lying west of Mt. Washington. Incidentally, the question of service to Govans and Hamilton, both in the Northern District, is involved, since these sections, together with Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton, are all supplied by the main line which originates at Catonsville, and is in turn supplied from the Patapsco River, both Catonsville and the Patapsco River being in the Western District. In the recent schedules, filed by the Company, the Western and Northern Districts were consolidated into one new district, known as the Avalon District.

FINDINGS OF FACTS.

Physical Layout at Time of Shortages.

For the reasons above stated, the investigation conducted by me covered the entire service of the Company in its Avalon District, the

object of the examination of witnesses being, as stated by the Assistant General Counsel, to find which links in the chain of service to Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton were strong and which were weak. Consequently, the investigation began with the Patapsco River—the source of supply, and followed that supply from that point, step by step, into the homes of the Company's patrons in Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton. This method of investigation as to the Company's physical layout will be followed by me in stating my findings.

FINDING No. 1.

Patapsco River Supply.

The mean flow of the Patapsco River at the point of the Company's Avalon dam is approximately one hundred and fifty millions of gallons per day. The Company's water rights as at present exercised permit it to divert a maximum of three million gallons of this flow per day. In addition it has the option of increasing the amount of such diversion from time to time as required up to the full flow of the river, upon making the payments stipulated in the deed conveying such rights. The average amount of water actually diverted at the present time is 1,750,000 gallons per day, and its maximum at any time, 2,250,000 gallons, or about 1½ per cent. of the capacity of the river.

My finding in this connection is, that the capacity of the Company's supply is many times in excess of its present requirements, and will remain amply adequate for many years to come.

FINDING No. 2.

The Avalon Pumping Plant.

This plant consists of two power pumps of a rated pumping capacity of 1,500,000 gallons per day each, and a steam turbine pump of a rated capacity of 3,000,000 gallons per day; an aggregate pumping capacity of 6,000,000 gallons per day. The Company's average daily pumpage, as above stated, is 1,750,000 gallons per day and its maximum 2,250,000 gallons.

My finding in this connection is that the capacity of this plant is materially in excess of the Company's present requirements, and affords a margin of safety which is ample for all reasonably probable contingencies in future.

FINDING No. 3.

The Avalon Filter Plant.

This plant consists of a slow sand filter with a capacity of 1,250,000 gallons per day, and a rapid sand filter with a capacity of 2,500,000 gallons per day.

My finding is that both the adequacy and efficiency of these filters are ample for every reasonable requirement of the Company.

FINDING No. 4.

Main Line Avalon to Catonsville.

This line is approximately three miles in length, and is made up of varying lengths of 16, 12 and 10 inch cast iron mains terminating at the Catonsville reservoir.

My finding is that this line is reasonably adequate for the requirements of the Company in the present and immediate future.

FINDING No. 5.

Catonsville Reservoir.

The capacity of this reservoir is six million gallons. Its elevation, when full, is 524 feet above mean low water level. This reservoir supplies primarily Catonsville and other portions of the Western District, but also serves for the impounding of the water to be pumped from the repumping station to the Company's Northern District.

My conclusion is that the capacity of this reservoir is ample for the Company's requirements.

FINDING No. 6.

Catonsville Repumping Station.

This plant consists of two centrifugal pumps of a rated capacity of 2,000,000 gallons per day each, and a triplex pump with a rated capacity of 800,000 gallons per day; an aggregate of 4,800,000 gallons per day. In connection with these pumps, to insure uniformity of pressure and supply, the Company maintains a balancing standpipe at Catonsville, which is 125 feet high, having a capacity of 400,000 gallons and an elevation at its base of 506 feet above mean low water level.

My finding is that this repumping plant is adequate for the requirements of the Company.

FINDING No. 7.

Main Line to Towson Reservoir.

This line consists of a series of connecting mains of varying diameters, substantially as follows: 12-inch from the Catonsville repumping station to Belvidere Avenue and Pimlico Road; 10-inch to Lake and Bellona Avenues; 10-inch to York Road; 6-inch and 10-inch along York Road to Stevenson Lane; 10-inch along Stevenson Lane to the Towson reservoir and standpipe at Aigburth. This line is approximately 20 miles in length.

It will not deliver safely over 1,000,000 gallons of water per day from the Catonsville repumping station to the Towson standpipe, with the existing head of approximately 125 feet. The demands upon this line are at times considerably in excess of the above figures. It will

be thus seen that while the repumping station at Catonsville has a pumping capacity of 4,800,000 gallons per day, not more than approximately one-fifth of this pumping capacity could be utilized so far as Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton were concerned under conditions existing prior to the installation of the booster pump at Mt. Washington, referred to in the Company's answer and in the Chief Engineer's report hereinbefore referred to. The effect of the installation of such booster pump and other methods designed to increase the delivery capacity of such main line from Catonsville to Towson will be discussed later.

My finding is that prior to August 2, 1918—the date upon which the installation of said booster pump was completed—said main line from Catonsville to Towson was, at times, inadequate to meet the demands upon the same when operated under the conditions then existing, and that such inadequacy was the principal cause of the shortage in the Company's supply to the residents of Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton during the summer of 1917, and to the residents of Towson, Lutherville, Ruxton, Govans, Hamilton and the intermediate points during the summer of 1918. The immediate cause of the Govans, Hamilton, shortage of 1918 was an order of the State Board of Health requiring the Company to shut off these sections in order that Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton might be supplied.

I am not to be understood from the above, as finding that the main pipe line itself was of insufficient diameter or strength. I do not so find. I merely find its delivery capacity was inadequate when operated under the above conditions. The delivery capacity of a water pipe or main depends upon both its diameter and the velocity with which water is discharged therefrom. The velocity depends upon the pressure which must be exerted behind the column of water to be discharged. The pressure necessary to be exerted to discharge the water at a given velocity from an outlet of given size depends upon the head against which such pressure is exerted; and this head, in turn, depends upon the elevation of such outlet and frictional losses within the main itself. Hence, the diameter of a water main is only one of a number of factors which enter into the question of its capacity, and if the capacity of the mains is inadequate under any given conditions, such capacity can be increased in a variety of ways entirely independent of increasing the diameter of the main itself.

FINDING No. 8.

The Towson Reservoir.

The Towson reservoir at Aigburth has a capacity of 4,000,000 gallons—a depth of 21 feet and an elevation of 500 feet at the surface of the water when full. This reservoir is designed at the present time to serve Govans, Hamilton and intermediate points. Under plans now proposed by the Company, and which will be considered later, this

reservoir will be called upon to serve Lutherville and Ruxton as well.

My conclusion is that such reservoir is of a location, elevation and capacity ample to serve all such localities, if said reservoir itself is in turn amply supplied from the Catonsville repumping station.

FINDING No. 9.

The Towson Standpipe.

The Towson standpipe at Aigburth has a capacity of 175,000 gallons, an elevation at the base of 500 feet and a height of 48 feet. Under the arrangement now in effect the water is pumped from the Catonsville repumping station along the route indicated in my finding No. 7 to this standpipe. When the standpipe is full a valve closes automatically and shuts off the supply to the standpipe. At the same time a second valve opens automatically and admits the water from the main line into the adjacent reservoir. As the water in the standpipe is lowered to a certain point the first valve referred to opens and the second valve closes, thus admitting the water again to the standpipe and excluding it from the reservoir. Under such present arrangement the water from the standpipe is distributed to Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton, and when the standpipe is approximately full, is delivered in sufficient quantity to serve those sections adequately with the exception of the upper floors of a few houses at the highest elevations along the Joppa Road in and near Towson, in which instances the service is not wholly adequate on such upper floors under ordinary operating conditions, but is fully adequate in all other respects.

The residents of Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton are entirely dependent upon this standpipe for their supply and in that respect suffer a disadvantage in comparison with the residents of Govans and Hamilton, who ordinarily get their supply directly from the main line, and have in addition the benefit of the reserve of four million gallons in the Towson reservoir.

My conclusion is that when such standpipe is adequately supplied by the main line from the Catonsville repumping station, said standpipe is reasonably adequate for the service for which it was designed, but in view of possible occasional interruptions in the service, naturally incident to the average water supply service, said standpipe, as at present operated, does not afford a reasonably sufficient guarantee of that continuity of service to which patrons of the respondent Company are fairly entitled.

My further conclusion is that if Lutherville and Ruxton are taken off said standpipe, as is now proposed by the Company, and other proper steps are taken to insure an adequate supply of water to the standpipe, such standpipe will be adequate in design, location, elevation and capacity to render the residents of Towson and its immediate vicinity reasonably adequate service.

FINDING No. 10.

Auxiliary Pump at Towson Reservoir.

Several years ago the respondent Company installed at Aigburth a gasoline engine driven centrifugal pump, with a rated capacity of a million gallons per day, designed to draw water from the reservoir and pump it into the standpipe in the event of trouble at the Catonsville repumping station, or on the main line from Catonsville to Towson. This pump is of such a design that it will not draw water from the reservoir, unless such water is at a depth of twelve feet or more. Consequently, when there is a break-down anywhere along the line, which makes it impossible to force water into the standpipe, and the water in the reservoir is drawn down eight or nine feet by the demand from Govans and Hamilton, it is impossible with such pump to force any water from the reservoir into the standpipe, which supplies the mains to Towson. In view of the possibility of breakdowns, such as those above referred to, which have several times occurred in the past, and of the serious inconvenience and danger resulting to the public dependent upon this standpipe for water for domestic and fire service, my conviction is that this auxiliary pump should be replaced by some other form of pump more adequately designed to meet the requirements of situations such as the above.

It was suggested by the President of the Company, when on the witness stand, that it would be bad operating practice to install and depend upon an independent auxiliary unit of the kind referred to. But where the main pumps supplying the standpipe are over twenty miles away and a reservoir nearly half full of water is only fifty feet away, it would seem reasonable that more adequate means should be devised to bridge over that vitally important distance in cases of emergency.

FINDING No. 11.

Mains from Standpipe to Towson, Etc.

The Company's mains from the Aigburth standpipe to Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton as well as the mains from the reservoir and main line supplying Govans, Hamilton and intermediate points are of various sizes.

I find they are amply adequate for all reasonable requirements.

FINDING No. 12.

Service Connections.

Many of the service connections in Towson and Lutherville have been installed from fifteen to twenty-five years. Experience shows that where relatively small service pipes—one-half and three-quarter-inch—remain in service, without renewal, over such long periods of

time, they become clogged up to a material extent with accumulated sediment, rust and corrosion, to such an extent that they are no longer able to deliver water in quantities required, unless the pressure is greatly increased. Pressures are ordinarily designed with reference to pipes and fixtures of normal capacity.

My conclusion upon this point is that, aside from the question of actual stoppage of the supply, a great deal of the trouble complained of by residents of the sections involved on the ground of inadequate pressure is due to the fact that service pipes have gone too long without renewal. The remedy in these cases is a renewal of the service pipes which are in the condition above described.

Responsibility for Shortages of Supply.

From time to time in the past there have been shortages of greater or less duration in the Company's water supply to the Towson, Lutherville, Ruxton section. Some of these shortages occurred at times other than periods of heavy draft upon the supply; were of short duration and are shown by the evidence or records of the Commission to have been due to causes beyond the control of the Company, and which the Company could not have been expected to guard against.

The principal shortages were those occurring in July and August, 1917, and in July and August, 1918.

I will consider these in the order stated.

FINDING No. 13.

Shortage in the Summer of 1917.

At the conclusion of the hearing of August 16, 1917, before this Commission upon the complaint of residents of Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton, the Assistant General Counsel to the Commission requested the President of the Water Company to prepare and furnish, at an early date, a diagram showing the yearly and daily average pumpage from the Catonsville repumping station during past years. (See File No. 102, Case No. 375.)

This diagram was furnished August 20, 1917 (Exhibit No. 4 in this case) and demonstrated clearly the existence of a gradually increasing demand upon the Company's Catonsville-Towson main line, from July, 1912, to July, 1917, inclusive. The diagram further demonstrated that this demand was becoming relatively more and more constant during the months of July, August and September each year, and that for several years past it had been almost, if not quite, up to the safe capacity of such main line when the Catonsville pumps were operated against the head required to supply the Towson standpipe.

These facts were all known to those in charge of the Company's operations, were matters of accurate record and the Company is

chargeable with knowledge of the deductions logically to be drawn from such facts.

Under these circumstances my conclusions are that the Company was remiss in not taking the steps necessary to prevent the Towson-Lutherville-Ruxton shortage of July-August, 1917.

The Company's excuse was that by reason of the pendency of its rate and valuation proceedings, it was unable to secure the capital with which to purchase the equipment necessary to avoid such prospective shortage.

This fact is certainly no justification for making the residents of Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton go without water for days and weeks at a time, especially in view of the fact that during the period antedating this shortage the Company was paying dividends to its stockholders considerably in excess of the amount which would have been required to install the necessary equipment.

FINDING No. 14.

Shortage in the Summer of 1918

At the hearing of August 16, 1917, upon the complaints of the residents of Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton, the President of the Water Company stated that steps had been taken to provide against a recurrence of the water supply shortage in future years by providing a booster-pump to be installed on the Catonsville-Towson main line at Mt. Washington, and by enlarging the size of the main from the York Road along Stevenson Lane to the Towson reservoir; the object of both of these installations being to reduce the head against which the Catonsville pumps were required to operate, and thereby increase the capacity of the Towson-Catonsville main line.

The Commission was given the most positive assurance by the President of the Company that these installations would be completed well in advance of July and August, 1918. (See page 53, File No. 102 in Case No. 375.) At the same time the President of the Company stated that the Company had in contemplation the construction of a low-level new line of mains from the Towson reservoir to the intersection of Boyce and Bellona Avenues, where such new line would connect with the existing mains supplying Lutherville and Ruxton; the effect of this installation being that Lutherville and Ruxton, which have an elevation of from 300 to 400 feet, could be supplied by gravity from the Towson reservoir (500 feet elevation) and the Towson standpipe thus be left for the exclusive use of the residents of Towson. A further effect of this installation would be to reduce the period during which the Catonsville pumps would have to pump against the Towson standpipe and enlarge the period during which they could pump to the lower level of the reservoir, thus increasing materially the daily delivery capacity of the Catonsville-Towson main line. No promise was made as to when this last mentioned improvement would be made;

the President of the Company stating that the prices of cast iron pipe were at that time virtually prohibitive.

The Complainant in the case now before me contends that while the first two changes above referred to were promised well in advance of the summer of 1918, neither had been completed by that date, by reason of which another grave shortage of water had occurred. The Complainant further questioned whether these two changes would permanently correct the trouble.

It should first be determined whose fault it was that these changes were not made as promised.

The evidence shows that the booster-pump equipment was covered by separate orders; the booster-pump proper; the pump fittings, pipe joints and valves and a gasoline engine to operate the pump.

The order for the booster-pump was placed July 13, 1917, with the Lawrence Machine Company of Lawrence, Mass., for delivery within three months from date of order. The order for the engine was given July 24, 1917, to the Wisconsin Motor Company of Milwaukee for delivery in five months, that being the earliest delivery the Motor Company would promise. Before the castings, pipe joints and valves could be ordered, it was necessary to have final drawings for the same from the Lawrence Machine Company. There was delay on the part of that Company in furnishing these drawings and they were not actually sent to the Water Company until November, 1917. Immediately upon receipt of these drawings, the Water Company placed its order for the pump fittings and pipe joints with the R. D. Wood Company, of Florence, N. J., and the order for the valves with the Eddy Valve Company, both for immediate delivery.

The engine was completed January 20, 1918—one month after the promised date of delivery. It then became necessary to have the engine shipped to the Lawrence Machine Company to be fitted to the pump. The Water Company ordered this shipment to be made by express in order to expedite delivery. The express company refused to accept the shipment because of war conditions. The Water Company promptly reported this fact to this Commission, which immediately telegraphed the President of the American Express Company requesting him to accept and expedite the shipment. The engine was then accepted by the express company, but was not delivered to the Lawrence Machine Company until the latter part of March. When the engine was received by the Lawrence Machine Company it was discovered that some errors had been made which necessitated changes in the pump base. These changes were completed early in April and the Engineer of the Water Company made two trips to Lawrence to supervise the testing of the equipment and expedite its shipment. The work was not completed until April 24, 1918, when the railroad companies refused to accept the shipment because of less than carload lots embargo. The Water Company then ordered a whole car for the shipment, but the railroads refused even then to accept it because of war conditions. The Water Company then appealed to the United

States War Department to have the shipment treated as a war order, because intended for use in connection with the United States Base Hospital at Evergreen. Such order was obtained and the shipment made April 29. It was not received at Mt. Washington until some time in June—more than a month later.

Meantime the Water Company had been in almost daily communication by letter and telephone with R. D. Wood & Co., of Florence, N. J., relative to the pump fittings and pipe joints, and with the Eddy Valve Company relative to the valves. Both Companies were overrun with war orders and it was not until July 2, 1918, that the Water Company was able to get priority orders upon these Companies from the War Department. As a result of such priority order upon the R. D. Wood Company the fittings and pipe joints were received at Mt. Washington July 23, 1918. The valves have not yet been received, but the Water Company was subsequently able to utilize some lighter valves which it had on hand.

The work of installing the pump in the building previously prepared for it was begun July 24 and the employees of the Water Company worked day and night, including Sunday, until August 2, when the pump was cut into service.

The following day one of the bearings of the engine burned out and the Company had other bearings made. Thereafter the bearing burned out a second time and a third time, resulting in delays of many hours each time. Finally the engine was taken down and it was discovered that some small steel disks had been placed in an oil duct by some person with the intent of damaging the engine. These disks were removed and the pump finally started on August 8. Since that date it has been running regularly and the Towson standpipe has had continuously a full supply of water.

My finding upon these facts is that the Water Company was in no way at fault with respect to the delays in getting the booster-pump and putting it in operation between the date it was actually ordered and the present time.

The total cost of the booster-pump equipment was, however, less than \$10,000 in the aggregate, and in my opinion work upon this installation should have begun more than two years ago as suggested in my Finding No. 13 instead of being deferred until July, 1917.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS OF THE PROBLEM.

FINDING No. 15.

Booster-Pump as a Solution of the Problem.

The effect of the booster-pump at Mt. Washington, when in operation, has been to materially add to the delivery capacity of the Catonsville-Towson main line, and to bring that delivery capacity up to a point materially in excess of the requirements of the public since August 8,

as is shown by the fact that it has not been necessary to operate the pump more than eighteen hours per day in order to keep the Towson standpipe up to its required capacity.

Nevertheless, I do not regard the booster-pump as a final solution of the problem which confronts the rapidly growing section served with water through the Catonsville-Towson line.

This pump is located at a point more than five miles distant from the reservoir at Towson and fifteen miles from Catonsville. It is operated with a gasoline engine without auxiliary or alternative power of any kind, although the building in which it is located is wired for electric current. On occasions of extremely heavy draft from Govans, Hamilton, Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton the pump must be operated at full speed for long periods at a time. It is well within reason that it may have to be operated at times on such occasions continuously for several successive days at a time. The gasoline engine should eventually, if not immediately, be supplemented by an electrically driven motor of ample capacity.

The evidence shows that the Water Company has on hand a motor of this character, and intends to install the same at an early date. When so equipped the booster-pump will be amply adequate for the service which it is designed to render.

However, even with such additional equipment the booster-pump alone will not, in my opinion, finally solve the problem, since the second great defect in the Company's system, as at present operated, is that the residents of Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton are wholly dependent both as to water pressure and supply upon the Towson standpipe, which has a storage capacity of but 175,000 gallons, or but little over a day's supply for these communities, in the event of serious trouble upon the Catonsville-Towson main line.

FINDING No. 16.

Proposed Low Grade Line to Lutherville and Ruxton.

This proposition has already been explained briefly in my Finding No. 14. On February 20, 1918, the Water Company ordered 15,000 feet of 12-inch wood pipe for the purpose of this extension of its lines; delivery of such pipe having been promised July 1, 1918, but the same not yet having been shipped. Negotiations are now in progress for the required rights of way, and the President of the Water Company testified at the hearings: "I have no reason to believe the work will not be completed before the winter sets in." He also estimated that the cost of this work would not exceed \$25,000.

My finding upon this point is that the proposed improvement will result in the residents of Lutherville and Ruxton getting a continuously adequate supply of water, and will in addition give them the benefit, jointly with the residents of Govans, Hamilton and intermediate points, of the 4,000,000 gallon storage capacity afforded by

the Towson reservoir; thereby rendering them entirely independent of any ordinary breakdowns of the Company's service, between Catonsville and the Towson reservoir. A further effect of this improvement will be to give the residents of Towson the sole use of the Towson standpipe, which will insure them adequate pressure at all times and a reserve supply of several days in the event of a breakdown along the Catonsville-Towson main line. This reserve supply can be greatly augmented by the installation of a proper pump operating between the reservoir and standpipe as suggested in my Finding No. 10.

FINDING No. 17.

Stevenson Lane Improvement.

The object of this improvement is to reduce friction losses at the end of the Catonsville-Towson line, thereby adding to the delivery capacity of such line. The order for the 20-inch wood pipe necessary for this improvement was placed August 25, 1917. Owing to embargoes, delivery was delayed until April 22, 1918, when the first shipment was received; the remainder of the order having been received the following month. Excavation was begun June 1, 1918, and has been somewhat delayed by difficulties in employing labor. Such excavation has now been completed and the President of the Water Company testified that the entire work would be completed within thirty days. The total cost will be approximately \$20,000.

FINDING No. 18.

Dickeyville Booster-Pump Station

The suggestion of the installation of this station, substantially a duplicate of the Mt. Washington station, was made by Mr. Edwards, of the Commission's Engineering Department, and acquiesced in by the Company, which has already asked for quotations on a pump with both gasoline engine and electric motor equipment.

The effect of this installation would be to furnish alternative booster-pump service in the event of a breakdown of the Mt. Washington plant, and additional service in the event the Mt. Washington plant is not able to keep the delivery of the Catonsville-Towson line up to the requirements of the rapidly growing population of the sections served by such line. The cost of the Dickeyville installation will probably be between \$15,000 and \$20,000, but owing to war conditions it cannot, in all probability, be installed before June 1, 1919.

FINDING No. 19.

Increasing Height of Towson Standpipe.

This suggestion has been made as a possible solution of the Towson-Lutherville-Ruxton problem. The effect of such an increase in height

of the Towson standpipe would be to diminish rather than increase the delivery capacity of the Catonsville-Towson line, and thereby nullify to a great extent the advantages gained by the Stevenson Lane improvement and the Mt. Washington booster-pump installation.

I therefore find that this plan would be unwise and impracticable.

FINDING No. 20.

Enlarging or Duplicating the Catonsville-Towson Line.

The expense of such an improvement would be prohibitive.

FINDING No. 21.

The original cost of this line was approximately \$400,000. To duplicate it at present prices of material and labor would probably cost at least \$800,000. This investment would have to earn at least 9 per cent. in order to pay for maintenance, taxes, depreciation and even a low rate of return. The result would be nearly to double the service rates which would have to be charged to Company's patrons in the Northern District.

If, hereafter, Baltimore City undertakes to serve Govans, Hamilton, Mt. Washington and other portions of the Company's Northern District within the new city limits, the additional line would be practically of no value whatever. Moreover, the duplication of the present line would be merely to add to the delivery capacity of the Catonsville-Towson line, and, as I have already attempted to show, the same result can be obtained by the Stevenson Lane improvement, the two booster-pump stations and the low level line to Lutherville and Ruxton.

Under such circumstances I find that it would be a great waste of money to order this improvement.

FINDING No. 22.

Gunpowder River Supply.

Some years ago the Water Company had surveys made for the development of its Gunpowder River water rights in connection with its Herring Run District supply and a proposed new Northeastern District, which was to embrace Hamilton and other sections along the Harford and Belair Turnpikes.

It has been suggested that this development would result in the improvement of conditions at Govans, Towson, Lutherville and Ruxton.

The evidence shows that under present conditions the cost of this development would be not less than \$1,500,000.

I find this plan to be entirely impracticable and unnecessary at the present time as a possible solution of the Towson-Lutherville-Ruxton problem.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

My recommendations in the premises are that an order be passed requiring the respondent Company to do the following things within the periods respectively prescribed:

First—To complete within thirty days its Stevenson Lane improvements now in progress.

Second—To proceed forthwith to acquire the rights of way necessary for the construction of its proposed low level line to the intersection of Boyce and Bellona Avenues for the benefit of its patrons in Lutherville and Ruxton, and having acquired such rights of way, to proceed with the work of construction at once; such constructions to be completed not later than January 1, 1919.

Third—To proceed forthwith to install an auxiliary electric motor at its Mt. Washington booster-pump station; said installation to be completed at the first reasonable opportunity which can be taken without interfering with the continuity of the action of the existing installation and in no event later than December 1, 1918.

Fourth—To proceed forthwith to secure the necessary equipment for the installation of a second booster-pump station at the proposed location at Dickeyville; such installation to be completed not later than June 1, 1919.

Fifth—To proceed forthwith to secure a new pumping equipment or alter its present pumping equipment at its Towson reservoir so that said pump will be available at all times and under all reasonable conditions to pump water from said reservoir into the standpipe when for any reason it is not possible or convenient to pump water into said standpipe directly from the Catonsville-Towson main line; the work of such installation or alteration to be done under the supervision and subject to the approval of the Chief Engineer of this Commission, and to be completed within thirty days, or such longer period as said Chief Engineer may certify as reasonably required to secure any necessary additional equipment.

Sixth—To report in detail to this Commission at monthly intervals its progress upon such of the above installations as may not, from time to time, have been fully completed.

The combined effect of the above changes and improvements will be substantially as follows:

First—The residents of Towson will be assured a continuous supply of water at adequate pressure, even during periods of greatest draft, for many years to come and will be given incidentally in cases of emergency the benefit of the reservoir storage and no longer be dependent upon the ability of the Catonsville repumping station to fill the Towson standpipe under adverse conditions.

Second—The residents of Lutherville and Ruxton will be taken off the 175,000 gallon standpipe and given the benefit of the reserve of 4,000,000 gallons, which the Company will be able to keep in its reservoir practically at all times.

Third—The residents of Govans, Hamilton and intermediate points will be given a more reliable service than heretofore, both from the main line which ordinarily serves them and from the Towson reservoir, which serves them when their draft exceeds the delivery capacity of the main line, or when there is trouble on the line between Catonsville and York Road.

Fourth—The patrons of the Company, generally, in the Northern District, including the above, will receive not only the benefits which will arise from greatly increasing the delivery capacity of the Catonsville-Towson line, but will also be given all reasonable assurances that in the event of any ordinary shutdowns at the Catonsville repumping station, or at any point on the Catonsville-Towson line, the reserve supplies and facilities available when all the above improvements are made will insure a reasonably adequate supply of water during the periods of such breakdowns, and the possibility of entire stoppages of the supply, such as have occurred in the past, will be reduced to a minimum.

ORDER No. 4468.

In the Matter of	
The Complaint of OSBORNE I. YELLOTT	}
vs.	
THE BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY	
	Before the
	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	Case No. 1573.

The above cause having come to be heard before Commissioner Legg on Wednesday, August 14, 1918, pursuant to Order No. 4454 of this Commission passed August 9, 1918, directing that the hearing therein be held before Commissioner Legg, and Commissioner Legg having on August 19, 1918, filed in these proceedings his findings of fact and recommendations, which said findings of fact and recommendations have been fully considered by this Commission as by law provided;

IT IS, THEREUPON, This fifth day of September, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the findings of fact and recommendations by Commissioner Legg filed in this cause August 19, 1918, be and the same are hereby approved; and

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company, the respondent herein, be and it is hereby required:

First—To complete within thirty (30) days from the date of this order its Stevenson Lane improvements now in progress.

Second—To proceed forthwith to acquire the rights of way necessary for the construction of its proposed low level line to the intersection of Boyce and Bellona Avenues, for the benefit of its patrons in Lutherville and Ruxton, and, having acquired such rights of way, to proceed with the work of construction at once, such construction to be completed not later than January 1, 1919.

Third—To proceed forthwith to install an auxiliary electric motor at its Mt. Washington booster-pump station; said installation to be completed at the first reasonable opportunity which can be taken without interfering with the continuity of the action of the existing installation, and, in no event, later than December 1, 1918.

Fourth—To proceed forthwith to secure the necessary equipment for the installation of a second booster-pump station at the proposed location at Dickeyville; such installation to be completed not later than June 1, 1919.

Fifth—To proceed forthwith to secure a new pumping equipment, or alter its present pumping equipment at its Towson reservoir, so that said pump will be available at all times and under all reasonable conditions to pump water from said reservoir into the standpipe, when for any reason it is not possible or convenient to pump water into said standpipe directly from the Catonsville-Towson main line; the work of such installation or alteration to be done under the supervision and subject to the approval of the Chief Engineer of this Commission, and to be completed within thirty days from the date of this order, or such longer period as said Chief Engineer may certify as reasonably required to secure any necessary additional equipment.

Sixth—To report in detail to this Commission at monthly intervals beginning September 30, 1918, its progress upon such of the above installations as may not, from time to time, have been fully completed.

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That a copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper officers of the respondent Company, and that said Company, within twenty days from the receipt of such copy, notify this Commission whether or not it will abide by and accede to the terms thereof.

ORDER No. 4470.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Approval of an Agreement Dated April 17, 1918, Between Said Company and THE POSTAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY Covering the Sale by the Latter to the Former of Two Poles Situated on Light Street in the City of Baltimore, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954 Entered July 26, 1911, in Case No. 1151.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1578.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this ninth day of September, in the year of 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4472.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of GEORGE W. KING,
ET AL.,

vs.

IDLEWYLDE REALTY COMPANY

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1575.

WHEREAS, This case involving the adequacy of the water supply furnished at Idlewylde, Baltimore County, Maryland, by the Idlewylde Realty Company being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been made by the Commission, and

WHEREAS, The Commission being of the opinion and finding that in order that the respondent, Idlewylde Realty Company, shall furnish at all times a safe, adequate and continuous supply of water, said respondent should forthwith repair the elevated tank used by it and that auxiliary pumping equipment be installed, as heretofore recommended by the Chief Engineer of this Commission in his Report No. 1169, File No. 5, herein,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 10th day of September, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the Idlewylde Realty Company be and it is hereby directed and required within ten (10) days of the date hereof, to make such repairs to its elevated tank as are necessary in order to render said tank watertight and efficient and within thirty (30) days of the date hereof to provide and install auxiliary pumping equipment.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That a certified copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of the respondent company and that said company notify the Commission in writing within five (5) days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4473.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated August 16, 1918, with JOSEPH A. ROSS for the Sale by the Latter and the Purchase by the Former of Certain Telephone Facilities Located in District No. 3, Talbot County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913 Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1579.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this eleventh day of September, in the year of 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4475.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated July 20, 1918, with THE BEL AIR ELECTRIC COMPANY for the Sale by the Former and the Purchase by the Latter of Two Poles, Located Northeast of Fallston-Bagley Road, Southeast from the County Road to Record District No. 3, Harford County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913 Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1580.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this sixteenth day of September, in the year of 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4478.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of THE PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

vs.

THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY OF BALTIMORE with Respect
to the Fairness and Reasonableness of
Its Proposed General Increase in Its
Passenger Rates.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1583.

Albert G. Towers, John Milton Reifsnider and James C. Legg, members of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, by William Cabell Bruce, their General Counsel, complaining against the United Rail-

ways and Electric Company of Baltimore, a body corporate, duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Maryland, and engaged in the business of a "common carrier" or "street railroad corporation" within the City of Baltimore and its environs within the State of Maryland, say:

That the rates and charges proposed to be charged and collected by the said Company under the provisions of its general schedule of proposed passenger rates for the conveyance of passengers over 12 years of age and of children between the ages of 4 and 12 years on any of its lines between certain points designated in said schedule, or between intermediate points in either direction, with free transfers as at present, which schedule was filed with the Public Service Commission on August 28, 1918, as P. S. C. Md. No. 8, effective October 1, 1918, are excessive, unjust, unfair and unreasonable.

WHEREFORE, It is this 18th day of September, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That a copy of this complaint and order be forwarded to the said United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that the matters complained of be satisfied by the said body corporate, or that the charges therein be answered in writing by the said body corporate within ten (10) days of the service of this complaint and order.

ORDER No. 4491.

In the Matter of	}	
The Complaint of THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND		Before the
vs.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE with Respect to the Fairness and Reasonableness of Its Proposed General Increase in Its Passenger Rates.		Case No. 1583.

In the foregoing case it is this 26th day of September, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen,

Ordered, 1. That the issues raised by said Complaint and Answer be and they are hereby set for hearing on the 18th day of November, 1918, at 10 A. M.

2. That the Company keep the Commission advised of the result of the increase set forth in the Tariff Schedule filed August 28, 1918, to

take effect October 1, 1918, and that such results be tabulated in such way as shall be approved by the accounting department of the Commission under the direction of the Assistant General Counsel.

ORDER No. 4492.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Complaint of ST. AGNES' HOSPITAL</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>vs.</i></p> <p>THE BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1534.</p>
--	---	---

Upon the order of the solicitor for the Complainant filed herein, it is this twenty-seventh day of September, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That this complaint be, and it is hereby, dismissed.

ORDER No. 4494.

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>The Application of the CITYCO REALTY COMPANY by John J. Hurst, Its Presi- dent, for the Approval of the Rates and Terms for Sewerage Installations at Ardmore Park.</p>	}	<p>Before the</p> <p>Public Service Commission of Maryland.</p> <p>Case No. 1582.</p>
--	---	---

WHEREAS, The Cityco Realty Company having made application to this Commission for its approval of certain rates and charges for installation of sewerage connection and maintenance thereof at Ardmore Park, Baltimore County, Maryland, as required by Chapter 804 of the Acts of General Assembly of Maryland, Session of 1914, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on to be heard, in accordance with the Commission's Order No. 4477 passed September 18, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the rates and charges aforesaid are just and reasonable,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the rates of \$25 for installation of sewerage connection and of \$4 per year for maintenance thereof, said maintenance charge being payable on or before January 1st of each year, in advance, now made and charged by the Cityco Realty Company in Ardmore Park, Baltimore County, Maryland, be and they are hereby approved by this Commission as being in all respects just and reasonable.

ORDER No. 4495.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of WILLIAM H. KILLIAN, ET AL.,		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		
THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE		Case No. 1574.

The above cause being at issue upon complaint and answer on file and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the westbound stop at Edmondson Avenue and Warwick Avenue should be restored during certain hours on Sundays,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore be and it is hereby directed and required to forthwith restore the westbound stop at Edmondson Avenue and Warwick Avenue on Sundays between the hours of 9.30 A. M. and 1.15 P. M. and between the hours of 7.30 P. M. and 10 P. M.

FURTHER Ordered, That a copy of this order be forthwith served upon the proper official of said The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and that said company notify this Commission in writing within five (5) days of the date of service of such copy whether it will abide by and obey the same.

ORDER No. 4496.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the Carriers Not Under Federal Control Named in the Official Classification by R. N. COLLYER, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 543.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of October, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, carriers not under Federal control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their agent, to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, departing from the provisions of this Commission's Circular No. 10-A so far as number of effective supplements is concerned, amending Rule 29 of said classification respecting tank cars of private ownership as set forth in petition herein,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4496, of date October 1, 1918."

ORDER No. 4498.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Application of THE BALTIMORE COUNTY WATER AND ELECTRIC COM- PANY for Authority to Issue \$150,000 of Its Short Term Six Per Cent. Notes.	}	Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1588.

WHEREAS, The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for authority to issue \$150,000 of its short term 6 per cent. notes, and for authority to pledge and issue as security for the redemption of said notes upon their maturities the payments to be made from time to time by The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore to the United States Mortgage and Trust Company, Trustee, under the Indenture Deed of Trust dated May 6, 1906, securing the issue of First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Gold Bonds of the applicant, as such payments are provided and required to be made under the terms and provisions of a certain agreement dated May 31, 1912, between The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company, Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and United States Mortgage and Trust Company, copy of which said last mentioned agreement has heretofore been filed with this Commission in Case No. 354, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on October 1, 1918, after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4486 passed September 23, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of said short term notes is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation, to wit: the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its plant and distribution system,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 2nd day of October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, (1) The issue and sale for cash at not less than 96 per cent. of their par value by The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company of its short term 6 per cent. notes in the amount of \$150,000, be and the same are hereby authorized and approved; each of said notes to be of the denomination of \$1,000; the entire issue to be in three series of the aggregate principal sum of \$50,000 each, to be numbered from 1-A to 50-A for the first series, 1-B to 50-B for the second series and 1-C to 50-C for the third series; all of said notes to be dated October 1, 1918, and to be payable to bearer, or the registered holder thereof, in the case of the notes of Series A on the first day of

June, 1919, in the case of the notes of Series B on the first day of June, 1920, and in the case of the notes of Series C on the first day of June, 1921; each and all in gold coin of the United States of America of or equal to the present standard of weight and fineness; and all of said notes to bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum, payable semi-annually in like gold coin on the first days of June and December of each year.

(2) That the issue and pledge by The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company as security for the redemption of said notes upon their maturities the payments to be made from time to time by The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore to the United States Mortgage and Trust Company, Trustee, under the Indenture Deed of Trust, dated May 6, 1906, securing the issue of First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Gold Bonds of the applicant, as such payments are provided and required to be made under the terms and provisions of a certain agreement dated May 31, 1912, between The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company, Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore and United States Mortgage and Trust Company, be and the same are hereby authorized and approved.

(3) That said The Baltimore County Water and Electric Company shall make reports to this Commission, duly verified by affidavits, as follows:

(a) Upon the issue and sale for cash of its short term notes, authorized and approved as aforesaid, or any part thereof, the fact of such issue and sale, the terms and conditions thereof, and the amount realized therefrom.

(b) At the termination of each and every period of six months from the date of this Order, the disposition and use made of the proceeds of said short term notes, and the facts and circumstances as to the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations and the construction, completion, extension and improvement of its plant and distribution system.

ORDER No. 4499.

In the Matter of	
LOUIS HAMILTON, Complainant,	
vs.	
THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY	
and	
THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendants.	
	Before the
	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	S. N. & R. Docket.
	Case No. 544.

REPARATION CLAIM \$14.83.

This is a petition filed by The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company by D. G. Gray, its Freight Traffic Manager, and joined in by The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, by George D. Ogden, its Freight Traffic Manager, on behalf of Louis Hamilton, complainant, for permission to refund unto said complainant that portion of freight bill rendered and collected by said railroad companies which is in excess of a just and reasonable charge upon shipment of fire wood between points on defendants' lines within the State of Maryland.

The petition sets forth that on March 15, 1918, shipment was made by the complainant herein, consigned to C. Hofberger & Co., over the railroads of the defendant companies from Woodstock, Maryland, to Baltimore, Maryland, of one carload of wood weighing 40,000 pounds, on which was charged sixth class rate of 7 cents per 100 pounds as per freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 937 issued by The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. Shipment moved over Baltimore and Ohio Railroad from Woodstock to Bay View, Maryland, and thence over Pennsylvania Railroad to destination.

There was in effect at the time shipment moved rate of 68 cents per 2,000 pounds on wood to Baltimore, P. R. R. delivery, from Marriottsville, Maryland, which point is in same direction and on same line of road and more distant than Woodstock, thereby violating Section 19 of the Public Service Commission Law, as regards the greater charge demanded and collected for the shorter haul. It is on the basis of the 68 cent rate that application is now made to refund, the present rate being \$1.10 per 2,000 pounds.

It is agreed among the interested parties that any order entered herein for refund on account of excessive freight charges collected on the shipment in question shall be in favor of Louis Hamilton.

The complainant claims and the defendants admit that the rate lawfully applicable at the time and over the route shipment moved was under all the circumstances and conditions then existing excessive and unreasonable, and that the rate of 68 cents per 2,000 pounds then in effect from Marriottsville to Baltimore would be a proper and reasonable rate to be applied to the shipment in question.

Upon consideration of the matter, it is this 3rd day of October, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the defendants, said The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company and said The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, are hereby authorized and empowered to refund unto the complainant, said Louis Hamilton, the sum of \$14.83, being the difference between the amount charged and collected, \$28.84, including war tax, for the carload weighing 40,000 pounds, based on rate of 7 cents per 100 pounds, and the amount properly chargeable, \$14.01, including war tax, at the rate of 68 cents per 2,000 pounds, as aforesaid, for the transportation of the shipment in question.

ORDER No. 4503.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Eight Poles Located on the East Side of Schoolhouse Lane, South of Fourth Avenue, District No. 5, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2954, Entered July 26, 1916, in Case No. 1151.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1594.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It Is, THEREFORE, On this seventh day of October, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4504.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and BALTIMORE, SPARROWS' POINT AND CHESAPEAKE RAILWAY COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Execution by Them of a Contract Between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore for Constructing a Double Track Branch from Their Present Electric Line to the Yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Subject to the Terms and Conditions Contained in Said Agreement and to Operate Cars Over Said Branch Line.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1595.

WHEREAS, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company have applied to the Public Service Commission of Maryland for its permission and approval to execute a contract between The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Company and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, for constructing a double track branch from their present electric line to the yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, subject to the terms and conditions contained in said contract, copy of which has heretofore been filed with the Commission, and to operate cars over said branch line, and

WHEREAS, The Commission has examined said contract and finds that the execution of the same by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and by Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company is convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 8th day of October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the approval and permission of the Commission is hereby given to the execution by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company of said contract between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation and Bethlehem Steel Company and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, for constructing a double track branch from their present electric line to the yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, subject to the terms and conditions therein contained, and to operate cars over said branch line.

PROVIDED, That when the total price to be paid for the double track branch in question by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation is determined upon, said amount shall be forthwith reported to this Commission by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and should said The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows' Point and Chesapeake Railway Company acquire said double track branch under the terms of the aforesaid contract, the amount paid by said Company or companies for said double track branch shall likewise be forthwith reported to this Commission.

ORDER No. 4508.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the Carriers Not Under Federal Control Named in the Official Classification by R. N. COLLYER, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 545.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof,

It IS, THEREFORE, This 14th day of October, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, carriers not under Federal control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their agent, to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, departing from the provisions of this Com-

mission's Circular No. 10-A so far as volume of supplemental matter is concerned, containing revision of Rule 5-A published in item 3, page 22 of P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44 and revision of paragraph 1825 of the I. C. C. regulations for the transportation of dangerous articles other than explosives, by freight, published on page 385 of P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, as set forth in petition herein,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

“Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4508 of date October 14, 1918.”

ORDER No. 4509.

In the Matter of

The Application of A. H. MORRIS, W. E. MANIFOLD, HENRY S. MERRYMAN and JAMES T. SMITH for an Order Permitting and Approving the Exercise of a Franchise Granted Them by the County Commissioners of Harford County, Maryland, and for Permission to Begin the Construction of Their Plant and Distributing System Under Said Franchise.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1527.

WHEREAS, A. H. Morris, W. E. Manifold, Henry S. Merriman and James T. Smith have applied to this Commission for an order permitting and approving the exercise by them of a franchise granted them by the County Commissioners of Harford County, Maryland, by resolution dated June 3, 1918, copy of which franchise is filed in these proceedings, and for permission to begin the construction of an electric plant and distributing system under said franchise, and

WHEREAS, The case having come on for hearing on June 19, 1918, after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4334 passed June 7, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of such franchise and the construction of such electric plant and distributing system under said franchise are necessary and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 15th day of October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the exercise by A. H. Morris, W. E. Manifold, Henry S. Merryman and James T. Smith of the franchise granted them by the County Commissioners of Harford County, Maryland, by resolution dated June 3, 1918, and the construction of an electric plant and distributing system under said franchise be and the same are hereby permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4510.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of JOHN S. FANGMEYER		Public Service Commission
vs.		of Maryland.
CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.		Case No. 1577.

The above cause having been previously set for hearing and having been heard on September 30, 1918, when both parties were represented in person or by counsel, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission that the complainant is not entitled to the relief for which he has prayed,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 15th day of 'October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the complaint in the above entitled matter be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

ORDER No. 4511.

In the Matter of

The Application of ROSOFF MOTOR
TRANSPORTATION COMPANY for a Per-
mit for the Operation of a Motor
Vehicle for Public Use in the Trans-
portation of Freight Between the
Maryland-Delaware State Line and the
City of Baltimore via Havre de Grace.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1596.

WHEREAS, The Rossoff Motor Transportation Company, a copart-
nership, having made application to this Commission for a permit for
the operation of motor vehicles for public use in the transportation
of freight between the Maryland-Delaware State Line and the City of
Baltimore, Maryland, via Havre de Grace, Maryland, and

WHEREAS, The application having this day come on for hearing in
accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4506 passed October 11,
1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due
hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting
of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 16th day of October, in the year Nineteen
Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Mary-
land,

Ordered, That the application of The Rossoff Motor Transporta-
tion Company in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby granted
and that the permit applied for be issued between Maryland-Delaware
State Line and the City of Baltimore, Maryland, via Havre de Grace,
Maryland.

ORDER No. 4514.

In the Matter of	}	
The Complaint of SUDBROOK PARK IM- PROVEMENT ASSOCIATION		Before the
vs.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
SUDBROOK DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.		Case No. 1394.

WHEREAS, This Commission on December 14, 1917, entered its Order No. 3994, in the above entitled matter directing and requiring the respondent, the Sudbrook Development Company, to adopt and put into operation certain improvements in its plant and distributing system and prescribing the manner of the operation of said plant, and

WHEREAS, This Commission on March 18, 1918, entered its Order No. 4212 in the above entitled matter confirming and still more specifically setting forth the improvements and changes to be adopted by the respondent in order to comply with the requirements of Order No. 3994 aforesaid, and

WHEREAS, On October 18, 1918, the respondent petitioned the Commission for certain modifications of its Order No. 4212 aforesaid, and

WHEREAS, Hearing upon said petition was had at the offices of the Commission on October 22, 1918, at which hearing the complainant association was represented by its president, Daniel H. Hamilton, and the respondent was represented by its counsel, H. T. Kellman, none of the operating officials of the respondent company being present at said hearing, and

WHEREAS, From the testimony produced at the hearing aforesaid it appears that the requirements of the Commission's Order No. 3994 as confirmed by its said Order No. 4212 have been only partially, if at all, complied with by the respondent and this despite the fact that more than ten months have elapsed since the said first mentioned Order was entered by this Commission, and

WHEREAS, It being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing and after full consideration of all the evidence and facts before it that the requirements of paragraphs 6 and 7 of Order No. 4212, aforesaid, should for the present be suspended, because of economic conditions created by the existing war, but that the other provisions of said Order should be promptly complied with,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 23rd day of October, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That as respects the changes and improvements required by paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8 of said Order No. 4212 of this Commission entered on March 18, 1918, said petition of the respondent for the modification of said order be and it is hereby rejected, except

that the time given the respondent in said order for compliance with the requirements of paragraph 8 of said Order is hereby extended until January 1, 1919.

2. That the requirements of paragraphs 6 and 7 of said Order No. 4212 be and they are hereby suspended until the further order of this Commission in the premises.

AND IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That a copy of this Order be forthwith served upon the respondent.

ORDER No. 4515.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF HAVRE DE GRACE		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1585.
HAVRE DE GRACE GAS COMPANY.		

WHEREAS, It appears from the papers filed in this case, and particularly from the letter of the Complainant filed herein on the date hereof that the complaint has been satisfied,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-third day of October, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That said complaint be entered as satisfied and the case closed.

ORDER No. 4519.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of the LAKELAND IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION for an Order Requiring The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore to		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
Extend Its Westport Line, Etc.		Case No. 1537.

WHEREAS, The Petitioner in this matter by Frederick Volland, Chairman of its Complaint Committee, did on October 14, 1918, file herein its request for postponement of any further action in the case until the close of the war in which this country is now engaged, and

this Commission having duly considered said request and being of the opinion that the same is reasonable and proper;

IT IS, THEREFORE, This first day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That all proceedings in the above entitled matter be, and they are hereby, suspended and postponed until the close of the present war, or to such time thereafter as may appear to this Commission to be necessary or advisable.

ORDER No. 4520.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of THE SUBURBAN WATER COMPANY for Permission to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement No. 2 to Petitioner's Rate Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 5.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		S. N. & R. Docket.
		Case No. 546.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 1st day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given The Suburban Water Company to file and publish and make effective as of October 1, 1918, Supplement No. 2 to petitioner's rate schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 5, changing the rates charged for water used for domestic purposes to following basis:

"For premises having only one spigot or other outlet a minimum charge of \$3 per quarter, entitling the consumer to 8,000 gallons of water per quarter, with excess at the rate of 50 cents per thousand gallons for all water consumed above the aforesaid 8,000 gallons.

"For other domestic establishments with more than one spigot or other outlet, \$4.50 per quarter, entitling the consumer to 12,000 gallons of water per quarter, excess above the aforesaid 12,000 gallons to be at the rate of 50 cents per thousand gallons."

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4520 of date November 1, 1918."

PROVIDED FURTHER, That this Commission by passing this order is not to be taken or construed as in any sense whatsoever passing upon the reasonableness of the rates contained in supplement filed hereunder, such rates being left as fully subject to investigation and correction upon complaint or upon the Commission's own motion as if this order had never been passed.

ORDER No. 4521.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of the ARLINGTON PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1584.
SUBURBAN WATER COMPANY.		

WHEREAS, This case involving the reasonableness of the rates established by the respondent, The Suburban Water Company, by its rate schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 5 effective July 1, 1918, being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties, and the complainant, the Arlington Protective Association, having expressed itself as satisfied with the rates this day filed with the Commission by the said respondent, which said rates are made effective as of October 1, 1918, and having asked that its complaint be dismissed,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 1st day of November, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission,

Ordered, That the above entitled case be and it is hereby entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4525.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of BALTIMORE AND BEL AIR EXPRESS COMPANY		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.		Case No. 1404.
The FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE COMPANY OF HARFORD COUNTY.		

WHEREAS, It appears from the papers filed in the above entitled matter that the Defendant has filed with the State Tax Commission its amended Charter, and

WHEREAS, The Commission has no longer jurisdiction over said Defendant touching the matters complained of in this cause,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This fourth day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled complaint be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, this Commission being without jurisdiction in the matter.

ORDER No. 4526.

In the Matter of

The Application of the MARYLAND UTILITIES COMPANY for Authority to Issue \$75,000 Face Amount of Its Bonds and \$40,000 Par Value of Its Stock for the Acquisition of the Property and Assets, Including the Good Will and Franchises of the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County in so far as the Same Refers to the Electrical Branch of Said Company and the Real Estate and Buildings of Said Company and of the Latter Company to Transfer the Same and of the Maryland Utilities Company to Exercise a Franchise Granted by Ordinance of the Mayor and City Council of Crisfield to the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County and by Said Company Assigned to the Maryland Utilities Company.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1415.

The applicants in the above entitled matter having failed to comply with the requirements of this Commission's Order No. 4018 entered herein on December 27, 1917, as modified and amended by Order No. 4310 entered on May 16, 1918, and application having been made to this Commission, Case No. 1597, for the permission and approval of the Commission, among other things, to the transfer and conveyance by the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County of all the property, franchises and good will of said company to The Consumers Ice Company,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 7th day of November, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That Order No. 4018 entered herein by this Commission on December 27, 1917, and Order No. 4310 entered herein by this Commission on May 16, 1918, be and they are hereby abrogated, annulled and set aside.

ORDER No. 4527.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CONSUMERS ICE COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Acquisition by It of All of the Property, Assets and Franchises of Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company and for the Transfer of the Same from the Latter to the Former Company, and for the Exercise by the Former Company of the Franchise Granted the Latter by the Mayor and City Council of Crisfield; and for Authority to The Consumers Ice Company to Issue \$32,500 Par Value of Its Preferred Stock and \$30,000 Par Value of Its Common Stock for the Acquisition of the Aforesaid Property, Assets and Franchises.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1597.

WHEREAS, The Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County, and The Consumers Ice Company, both corporations having been incorporated under the laws of the State of Maryland, have applied for the permission and approval of the Commission to the conveyance and transfer by the former, and the acceptance by the latter of all the real estate, buildings, machinery, property, assets, equipment and system for distributing electricity for light, heat and power and for manufacturing ice, together with the franchises and good will of the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County now belonging to the said Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County, and for the issuance by The Consumers Ice Company of \$32,500, par value, of its Preferred Stock, and \$30,000, par value, of its Common Stock, for the acquisition of said real estate, equipment, system and all other property to be transferred, assigned and conveyed by the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County to The Consumers Ice Company, in accordance with the terms set forth in the application in this case, and for an order permitting and approving the exercise by The Consumers Ice Company of a franchise heretofore granted the said Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Com-

pany of Somerset County by the Mayor and Council of Crisfield, State of Maryland, and the franchise granted by the Certificate of Incorporation and the Amended Certificate of Incorporation of said The Consumers Ice Company; and

WHEREAS, This case coming on to be heard on October 31, 1918, after due notice published in compliance with Order No. 4513 of this Commission passed on the 22nd day of October, 1918, and no protest having been made, and the Commission having determined that the proposed transfer and the exercise of the said franchises by The Consumers Ice Company will promote the interest, welfare and convenience of the community which the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County is now serving, as evidenced by letter from the Mayor and Council of Crisfield bearing date of November 4, 1918, and filed herein, and that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of \$32,500, par value, of Preferred Stock, and the issue of \$30,000, par value, of Common Stock, is reasonably required for the purposes of said corporation.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 7th day of November, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, 1. That the permission and approval of the Commission be, and are hereby given to the transfer and conveyance by the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County, and the acceptance by The Consumers Ice Company of all the real estate, buildings, machinery, property, assets, equipment and system for distributing electricity for light, heat and power and for manufacturing ice, together with the franchises and good will now belonging to the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County, upon the terms and conditions set forth in the application herein.

2. That the issue and delivery by The Consumers Ice Company of six hundred and fifty shares of its preferred capital stock, of the aggregate par value of thirty-two thousand and five hundred dollars, and of six hundred shares of its common capital stock, of the aggregate par value of thirty thousand dollars, for the acquisition of the property mentioned in the application in this case, be and the same is hereby authorized and approved.

3. That the exercise by The Consumers Ice Company of the franchise granted by the certificate of incorporation and amended certificate of incorporation, certified copies of which are filed herein, be and the same is hereby permitted and approved.

4. That the exercise by The Consumers Ice Company of the rights and privileges and franchises heretofore granted the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County by the ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the City of Crisfield, State of Maryland, a copy of which is filed herein, marked "Applicants' Exhibit No. 8," be and the same is hereby permitted and approved.

5. That the said Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company of Somerset County and The Consumers Ice Company shall make joint report to this Commission upon the consummation of the transfer and convey-

ance of the property, assets and franchises of the former to the latter, and upon the issuance of the preferred and common stock of said The Consumers Ice Company hereinbefore authorized and approved.

6. That said The Consumers Ice Company be and it hereby is directed and required to keep all of its books, records and accounts in such manner as to accurately separate and segregate its electric and ice operations.

ORDER No. 4528.

In the Matter of The Petition of THE BALTIMORE TRANSIT COMPANY for Permission Under Sec- tion 15 of the Public Service Commis- sion Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice a Schedule of Rates Changing Its Rate of Fare from Five Cents to Six Cents.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 547.
--	---	--

The above mentioned petition, together with exhibit in support thereof, having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 8th day of November, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be and it is hereby given to The Baltimore Transit Company to file and publish a supplemental schedule changing its rate of fare from five cents to six cents; such change to become effective on the 10th day of November, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen,

PROVIDED, Said schedule be filed with the Commission as required upon issuance of this Order and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said schedule should bear the following notation:

“Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4528 of date November 8, 1918.”

PROVIDED FURTHER, That this Commission by passing this order is not to be taken or construed as in any sense whatsoever passing upon the reasonableness of the rate contained in schedule filed hereunder, such rate being left as fully subject to investigation and correction upon complaint or upon the Commission's own motion as if this order had never been passed.

Ordered, That the Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company be and it is hereby directed and required to place on sale on or before November 30, 1918, and thereafter continue the sale thereof until the further order of this Commission in the premises, five tickets for thirty cents, good for five fares on the street railway lines of the respondent in the City of Hagerstown.

FURTHER Ordered, That with respect to the other matters and things complained of, the complaint in the above entitled matter be and the same is hereby dismissed.

ORDER No. 4532.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated June 11, 1918, with the MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF BERLIN, MARYLAND, for the Sale by the Former to the Latter of Seven Poles Located in the Town of Berlin, District No. 5, County of Worcester, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No 1601.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this 12th day of November, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4533.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated July 24, 1918, with CONSOLIDATED POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE for the Sale by the Former and the Purchase by the Latter of Two Poles Located on the South Side of Wagner's Point Road, West of the Drawbridge Spanning Long Cove, District No. 5, Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1602.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this 12th day of November, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4535.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and BALTIMORE, SPARROWS POINT AND CHESAPEAKE RAILWAY COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Execution by Them of a Contract Between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore for Constructing a Double Track Branch from Their Present Electric Line to the Yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Subject to the Terms and Conditions Contained in Said Agreement, and to Operate Cars Over Said Branch Line.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1595.

WHEREAS, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company did, on October 8, 1918, file their application with the Public Service Commission of Maryland for its permission and approval to execute a contract between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company, the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Company, and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, for constructing a double track branch from their present electric line to the yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, subject to the terms and conditions contained in said contract, a copy of which was therewith filed with the Commission, and to operate cars over said branch line; and the Public Service Commission of Maryland, after examining said contract, found that the execution of the same by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company was convenient for the public service, and by its Order dated October 8, 1918, granted the approval and permission of the Commission to the execution of said contract, subject to the terms and conditions contained therein and in said Order of the Commission; and

WHEREAS, The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company

subsequently filed a petition herein stating that said contract had been amended in certain particulars and filing with their last mentioned petition a copy of said amended contract and asking, for the reasons therein stated, the permission and approval of the Public Service Commission of the execution by them of said amended contract, subject to the terms and conditions contained in said amended contract, and to operate cars over said branch line; and

WHEREAS, The Commission has examined said amended contract and finds that the execution of the same by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and by the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company is convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This thirteenth day of November, in the year nineteen hundred and eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the approval and permission of the Commission is hereby given to the execution by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company of said amended contract between the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation and Bethlehem Steel Company, and The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, for constructing a double track branch from their present electric line to the yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, subject to the terms and conditions contained in said amended contract, and to operate cars over said branch line;

PROVIDED, That when the total price to be paid for the double track branch in question by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation is determined upon, said amount shall be forthwith reported to this Commission by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and should said The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and the Baltimore, Sparrows Point and Chesapeake Railway Company acquire said double track branch under the terms of the aforesaid contract, the amount paid by said Company or companies for said double track branch shall likewise be forthwith reported to this Commission.

ORDER No. 4538.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the Carriers Not Under Federal Control Named in the Official Classification by R. N. COLLYER, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 548.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 15th day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, the carriers not under Federal Control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their Agent, to file and publish on five days' notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, departing from the provisions of this Commission's Circular No. 10-A in so far as volume of supplemental matter is concerned, including necessary additions to, changes in and eliminations from the list of participating carriers contained in said classification, and containing revision of the classification specifications for finished passenger automobile bodies published on page 27 of Supplement No. 26 to P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, as set forth in petition herein,

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4538 of date November 15, 1918."

ORDER No. 4541.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Petition of CURTIS BAY RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 3.	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
	S. N. & R. Docket.
	Case No. 549.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 20th day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, the Curtis Bay Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 3, as per specimen copy of said tariff filed herein marked "Exhibit A," the effective date of said tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 3 to be not earlier than effective date of tariffs of connecting trunk lines, providing for the absorption of the increased switching charges of the Curtis Bay Railroad Company published in its tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 3 aforesaid,

PROVIDED, Said tariff be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4541 of date November 20, 1918."

ORDER No. 4543.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Complaint of MRS. HENRY A. LUCAS	Public Service Commission of Maryland.
vs.	
BROOKLYN AND CURTIS BAY LIGHT AND WATER COMPANY.	Case No. 1591.

This case being at issue upon complaint and answer filed and having been duly heard and submitted by the parties thereto, and full investigation of the matters and things involved having been had, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding that in order that the

respondent, The Brooklyn and Curtis Bay Light and Water Company, may furnish adequate service to the citizens of Brooklyn and Curtis Bay it is necessary for it to increase its supply or for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to withdraw its demand, and it appearing from certain papers filed herein since this case was heard that the Railroad Company has installed a water plant with ample capacity to supply all of its needs, thus relieving the unusual drain upon the supply of the Water Company and placing the respondent in a position to give adequate service to its other patrons in Brooklyn and elsewhere connected with its mains,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-fifth day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled matter be, and it is hereby dismissed, the complaint having been satisfied.

ORDER No. 4544.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY for the Issuance of a General Order by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Permitting Said Company from Time to Time to Sell, Lease or Otherwise Dispose of Obsolete, Worn-Out or Superfluous Items of Property Which Are Not Essential to Its Ability to Render Proper Service to the Public.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1605.

Upon the application of The Western Union Telegraph Company as above entitled and upon a full investigation and hearing, notice of which has been published as required by the Public Service Commission of Maryland in its Order No. 4540 entered in this case on November 18, 1918, it appearing that the Public Service Commission Law of Maryland requires the written consent of the Public Service Commission for the transfer, sale, lease or other disposition of property by telegraph companies; the transfer, sale, lease or other disposition of property by telegraph companies will in the majority of cases involve obsolete, worn-out or superfluous items of property the disposition of which in no wise affects the ability of the said companies to serve the public; that the consideration of unimportant and trivial cases of this kind are found to take a considerable amount of the Commission's time at hearings; that the said telegraph company has to incur clerical, advertising and legal expenses out of all proportion to the importance

of the matters involved; that the consummation of the conveyance or other disposition of property is considerably delayed; that the present procedure in handling such matters is unduly burdensome upon the said company and the Commission without any compensating advantage to the public; that the interests of the public will be fully conserved by the adoption of a simpler and more expeditious plan of procedure; that the real intent and purpose of the Legislature in granting such supervisory power to the Commission was to guard against the possibility of public utilities divesting themselves of property to such an extent as to interfere with their ability to serve the public adequately; and that the letter and spirit of the law will be fully complied with by having the said telegraph company send to the Commission for its files an executed copy of every agreement or other written instrument evidencing the sale, lease, transfer or other disposition of its property, accompanied by a letter setting forth informally in necessary detail the company's purpose in selling, leasing, transferring or otherwise disposing of its property, or in entering into the agreement for the sale, lease or other disposition of the property involved in each particular case.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 25th day of November, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the following procedure be adopted in all cases involving applications for the written consent of the Commission for the sale, lease, transfer or other disposition of property of The Western Union Telegraph Company, to wit:

1. That the application for approval be made by letter setting forth informally in necessary detail the Company's purpose in entering into the sale, lease or other disposition of property, or of entering into the agreement for the sale, lease or other disposition of the property involved in each particular case, accompanied by an executed copy of the agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction, and in addition thereto, for the convenience of the Commission, three copies of the following proposed form of order:

“PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

ORDER No. ____.

In the matter of the application of

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland

Case No. ____.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this.....day of....., in the year 19....., by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined there.

.....
.....
.....

Commissioners.

To.....

Take notice of an order, of which I certify the foregoing is a true copy.

.....
Secretary."

2. That upon the receipt of each application, agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction, and accompanying forms of proposed order, an employee of the Commission will promptly review the case and if it is found in no wise to affect the ability of the Company to serve the public adequately will recommend the signing of the porposed order, which will be formally executed by the Commission at its conference next following the receipt and review of the papers in each case.
3. That if the application and accompanying papers contain *prima facie* evidence that the ability of the said telegraph company to serve the public adequately would be endangered by the consummation of

the sale, lease, transfer or other disposition of property, the employee reviewing the submitted papers will so report to the Commission, and the Commission will then decide at its conference next following the said report whether the case is one sufficiently important to require a public hearing, and if so, will designate a date therefor, and if it is deemed necessary, will require the publication by the said telegraph company of a notice of hearing.

4. That in all cases which it deems important enough to require a public hearing the Commission will issue such order as to it may seem meet and proper.

ORDER No. 4545.

In the Matter of	Before the
The Petition of THE TOLCHESTER BEACH IMPROVEMENT COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Peti- tioner's Freight Tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 46.	Public Service Commission of Maryland. S. N. & R. Docket. Case No. 550.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 25th day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, The Tolchester Beach Improvement Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's freight tariff P. S. C. Md. No. 46, publishing class and commodity freight rates between Baltimore, Maryland, and Annapolis, Maryland, as per specimen copy of said tariff filed herein as exhibit,

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said rates be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4545 of date November 25, 1918."

OPINION

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Complaint of THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and the Application of Said Corporation for an Order Author- izing It to Increase the Price of Gas.		Public Service Commission of Maryland.
		Case No. 1519.

Appearances:

OSBORNE I. YELLOTT, ESQ., Assistant General Counsel of the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

CHARLES MARKELL, ESQ., of Haman, Cook, Chesnut & Markell, Counsel for Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore.

Hearings:

July 15, August 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, September 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 1918.

Arguments:

September 17, 18, 1918.

By the COMMISSION.

Filed November 25, 1918.

On April 4, 1918, The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore petitioned the Commission in these proceedings for permission to increase the price, both gross and net, of all gas sold by it at secondary or equivalent rates fifteen cents per thousand cubic feet, and the price, both gross and net, of all gas sold at net rates of sixty-five cents or over, ten cents per thousand cubic feet.

Prior to that date, to wit, November 28, 1917, the Company had filed, to become effective January 1, 1918, Supplements Nos. 16 to 21 inclusive, to its electric rate schedule P. S. C. Md. E-4, Supplements 16 and 17 being subsequently reissued in Supplements 26 and 27. Said revised schedule and accompanying supplements resulted in making material increases in the Company's existing rates to its larger electrical consumers, particularly the classes commonly known as industrial consumers. Such increased electrical rates were first attacked in a complaint filed February 13, 1918, by the Hess Steel Corporation (Case No. 1473) in which certain of those rates were alleged to be excessive, unfair and unreasonable. Subsequently the Commission, of its own motion, as by law provided, filed a complaint attacking such rates upon the same grounds. An answer was filed by the Company denying those charges, and the case came to a hearing March 20, 1918. The opinion of this Commission was filed in the above cases (Nos. 1473 and 1492) August 9, 1918, and on the same date the Commission passed

its Order No. 4452 upholding such rates in the main and declaring that they should remain effective for the period of two years from the date of such order, unless earlier modified or abrogated by the further order of this Commission. The effect of such revised electrical rates and the order of this Commission upholding the same was to increase greatly the revenues of the Company from its electrical business.

In 1912-13 this Commission had occasion to consider the gas and electric rates of the applicant, The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, upon complaints of David Bachrach and others as to the price of electricity to small consumers, and of James H. Preston, Mayor of Baltimore City, as to the prices of both gas and electricity generally. The investigation resulting from these complaints was most exhaustive, and the opinion of this Commission filed January 15, 1913, will be found in 4 P. S. C. Md. Reports (1913) pp. 39-58. On the same day the Commission entered its Order No. 1037 (p. 59) reducing the primary rate for electric service from ten cents per kilowatt hour to eight and one-half cents, and its Order No. 1038 (p. 60) reducing the primary or retail rate for gas from one dollar per thousand cubic feet, subject to a discount of ten cents for payment within ten days, to ninety cents, subject to such discount. These rates were to become effective July 1, 1913. The petitions in the above cases attacked the reasonableness of the maximum or primary rate only, but the orders in both instances directed the Company to revise its schedule of rates generally to conform to the primary rate so established.

The Company filed its electrical schedules accordingly, establishing a primary rate of eight and one-half cents per kilowatt hour, and making the monthly minimum charge one dollar. That portion of the above schedules relating to a monthly minimum charge was not in accord with the Commission's opinion, and on June 25, 1913, Order No. 1261 was passed providing for a yearly minimum charge of twelve dollars in lieu of the monthly minimum charge of one dollar proposed by the Company. (Vol. 4, pp. 227-8.)

Likewise the new gas schedules filed by the Company did not meet the approval of the Commission, and by Order No. 1262, passed June 25, 1913, these were modified to provide for a gross price to private consumers of ninety cents per thousand cubic feet, subject to a discount of ten cents for prompt payment where the consumption was less than fifty thousand cubic feet per month, of fifteen cents where the consumption was from fifty thousand to one hundred thousand cubic feet per month, and of twenty cents where the consumption was over one hundred thousand cubic feet per month, thus making the net rates, eighty, seventy-five and seventy cents respectively.

The changes which were subsequently made in the various electrical rates of the Company have been fully set forth in the opinion in Case No. 1492 above referred to and need not here be repeated.

The gas rates established by the orders of January 13 and June 25, 1913, above referred to remained in effect until April 1, 1915, when the

Company put into effect a schedule of industrial gas rates, under which gas was furnished for industrial uses to customers signing contracts for service for a period of three years. This schedule provided fixed costs, depending upon the hourly demand, in addition to running costs for the actual amount of gas consumed.

The Public Service Commission Law was amended by the General Assembly, Session of 1914, so as to enable the Commission to fix a heating value standard for gas, either in addition to a candle power standard or in substitution therefor, and after extensive investigation and full hearing in Case No. 837, the Commission, finding that the great portion of gas was used for heating purposes and for illumination through Welsbach burners and mantles, with which heating value is of prime importance, on April 17, 1915, entered its Order (Vol. VI, p. 151) establishing a State-wide heating value standard of 600 British thermal units per cubic foot, monthly average, with a minimum of 550 B. T. U., except in the case of The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, which Company was required to maintain in its product a heating value of not less than 645 British thermal units, monthly average, with a minimum of 595 B. T. U., and an illuminating power of not less than 20 candle power, the candle power standard having been theretofore required by local law and the heating value being that found to have existed prior to the rate reduction in 1913, with the right to said Company to adopt the single standard obtaining elsewhere through the State if it would at the same time reduce the rate charged by it for gas to eighty-five cents gross with ten cents discount for prompt payment, a net reduction of five cents per thousand cubic feet, which amount the Commission found fairly to represent the saving in cost to the Company of manufacturing the single standard product. The Company thereupon filed its bill of complaint in Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City praying for an injunction to restrain the Commission from enforcing its order aforesaid pending appeal, but after conference the Company agreed to accept the order and reduce the price of gas to seventy-five cents net per one thousand cubic feet if the Commission would postpone the effective date of its order from July 1, 1915, the date originally provided, to January 1, 1916, which change was subsequently made by Order No. 2381 entered June 25, 1915 (Vol. VI, p. 210). The rates for consumption beyond fifty thousand cubic feet per month were correspondingly reduced five cents per thousand cubic feet on January 1, 1916.

Effective after the February, 1916, meter readings, the Company established a new form of schedule applicable to domestic users, whereby the customer occupying a six-room house was charged four thousand cubic feet per month at the primary rate of seventy-five cents net and thirty-five cents per thousand cubic feet for all excess, the amount charged for at the primary rate being increased one thousand cubic feet for each additional room over six. Automatically applying this new schedule to old customers, the Company took as the primary rating of such customers the number of thousands of cubic feet per

month that was nearest to the maximum consumption by the particular customer in any month during the twelve months preceding the establishment of the schedule, subject to a minimum of four thousand cubic feet and further subject to the right of any customer to change to the room basis upon application. At the same time the Company established a schedule of yearly contract general gas rates, under which the primary and secondary rates were the same as those under the domestic schedule just referred to, the amount of gas charged for at the primary rate being one hundred and fifty hours per month of the maximum hourly demand. The industrial schedule before mentioned was at the same time amended, whereby all gas up to one million cubic feet per month was charged for at the rate of thirty-five cents net, and all excess consumption at the rate of thirty cents net, in addition to fixed charges of \$204 per year for the first three hundred cubic feet of demand, and \$48 per year for each additional one hundred cubic feet of demand.

The rates last above referred to remained in effect up until the date of the filing of the application in this case, and are still in effect.

The heating standard of 600 B. t. u. prescribed by the last order above referred to was observed and maintained substantially by the Company until November or December, 1917, when, by reason of the impossibility of getting a sufficient quantity of oil to maintain such standard, due to war and other abnormal conditions, the heating value of the gas produced by the Company was gradually reduced month by month until it reached the point of approximately 550 B. t. u. in the summer of 1918, at or about which point it has since been maintained with reasonable uniformity.

At the hearings in this case it was earnestly contended by the Company that the Commission should permit a further reduction in the heating value to 528 B. t. u., it being suggested that the Federal Government would shortly recommend such figure as the national gas heating standard in order to bring about a conservation of oil and induce the manufacture of toluol for war purposes. Since such a reduction in the heating standard would materially lessen the cost of manufacturing gas, this Commission has delayed the filing of its opinion and order in this case until it was finally determined what action the Federal Government would take with respect to such matter. It has been only within the past few days that the Fuel Administrator has formally announced that he will not recommend such reduction.

The representatives of the Company at the hearing urged that, independently of any action that the Federal Government might thereafter take with respect to the heating standard of gas, a reduction in the prescribed heating standard from 600 B. t. u. would result in a material reduction in the cost at which the gas could be furnished the public without any material detriment to the quality of the service. In the Gas Standard case above referred to, this Commission had occasion to go into this question at considerable length and decided, despite the protests of the representatives of the Company made to the same effect

at that time, that any material reduction in the heating value of gas below 600 B. t. u. resulted in an almost directly proportional diminution of the service value of the gas to the consumer. Since that time the New York Public Service Commission for the First District, *In Re Heating Standards for Gas*, Case 2235, decided October 13, 1917, reported in P. U. R. 1918-A, 357, has reached substantially the same conclusion. At the hearings in the case now before us considerable testimony was adduced, pro and con, upon this point, one of the witnesses in support of the above conclusion being Mr. R. S. McBride, of the Bureau of Standards, Washington. After the additional consideration which we have thus been able to give this question this Commission adheres to its former view to the effect that within reasonable limits the service value of gas varies almost directly with its heat value, and has further reached the conclusion that any further material reduction in the standard which has substantially been maintained by the Company for some months past, to wit, 550 B. t. u., would materially impair the value of such gas for domestic and commercial purposes. At the same time the Commission is convinced, in view of the character of the gas-using appliances now generally in use, that a return from the standard which the Company has been able substantially to maintain for some months past to the standard of 600 B. t. u. formerly established by the Commission, would not be justified at this time in view of the much greater cost attendant upon the manufacture of gas at such latter standard under existing conditions as to the cost of oil, etc. Consequently in the order which will be passed pursuant to this opinion, the Commission will establish a heating standard of 550 B. t. u. to be maintained by the Company within the reasonable limits of approximately four per cent. variation either way, until the further order of the Commission.

At the hearing in the case now before us the representatives of the Company contended that the increased rates applied for, both primary and secondary, even with a reduction in the heating standard from 600 to 528 B. t. u., were intrinsically reasonable to gas consumers both in comparison with the increased cost of production to the Company and in comparison with the increased value of the service to the consumer. The Company further contended that the aggregate increase in revenue sought by it through such increases was necessary and reasonable in order to maintain the dividends which the Company had previously been able to pay, and thereby preserve the credit of the Company during and after the war, and enable it to render efficient service. The Company further contended that such increases in revenue, together with the increases in its electrical schedules above referred to, would yield the Company less than a fair return on less than the fair value of its property.

Numerous exhibits were filed by the Company showing its corporate requirements during the year ended June 30, 1918, and purporting to show such requirements during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, with estimates of the amounts reasonably to be anticipated, in the

opinion of the Company's witnesses, to be derived under the existing and proposed rates.

These exhibits, in the form in which they were presented, fully substantiated upon their face the claims of the Company's representatives not only to the particular increases in rates proposed, but to further increases considerably in excess thereof.

The principals of these exhibits were in substantially the same form as those which had previously been filed with this Commission at the hearings in the electrical rate case above referred to, and were sought to be substantiated in that case by the most positive testimony upon the part of the Company's witnesses as to their reliability as authentic prognostications as to future operating results. But as a matter of fact, some of the more important exhibits filed in the electrical rate case were supplanted by other revised exhibits covering the same ground and filed before that case was decided, in which revised exhibits it was shown that many of the estimates contained in the original exhibits were erroneous. Subsequently when such exhibits were further revised for the purposes of this case, still further changes were made, and it was found that the revised exhibits above referred to were in turn erroneous in respect to many of the more important estimates contained therein. And indeed, since the hearings in this case, and as late as November 13, 1918, the Company has furnished the Commission further revisions of the figures contained in the exhibits filed in the two cases, all such later information furnished from time to time tending to demonstrate still further the inaccuracy of the earlier exhibits, and indeed almost to prove the utter futility of attempting to make accurate forecasts as to operating results under the abnormal conditions with which the public and the Company have been for some time past and are now confronted.

It is only necessary to review in a most general way some of the factors upon which the Company's future net income must depend in order to show the uselessness of any attempt of the Commission at this time, under existing conditions, to analyze the many exhibits filed in this case bearing upon the probable future net income of the Company.

The Company's Exhibits Nos. G-32 and G-38, respectively, with their several supporting exhibits, set forth in detail the revenues and expenses of the Company for the fiscal year 1918 and anticipated revenues and expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

In Exhibit No. G-32 the Company undertakes to show what will be its gross income and total operating expenses and taxes during the fiscal year 1919 on the basis of the former electrical rates which have since been increased by the order of the Commission above referred to and on the basis of furnishing gas at 600 B. t. u., which it has not done since December, 1917, and contended it should not be required to do in future. At the foot of the exhibit corrections are made on account of these items by the inclusion of estimates of the amounts anticipated

to be derived from the increased electrical rates and from the proposed increases in gas rates on the basis of 600 B. t. u.

In Exhibit G-38 the estimates are separated between the electric and gas divisions. At this point we are forced to enter a realm which is almost wholly one of speculation. In the first place, with the war pending as it was at the date of the hearings, and with it ended as it is at the present time, we are called upon to speculate generally as to the prospective receipts of the Company not only from the domestic consumers of both gas and electricity, but as well from the many industrial and commercial consumers in a great variety of enterprises, war and otherwise. Whatever trends might have been found to be established with the war in progress are now utterly destroyed when the war is ended, and no one can foretell, with any reasonable assurance of accuracy, what the consumption from many of these enterprises will be a month or six weeks from now. Yet the Commission is asked to make assumptions as to these possibilities, and base rates for the future thereon.

Again, when we come to the question of operating expenses, we are confronted by much the same situation. Many of these expenses vary in a more or less direct degree with the amount of business to be done, and this, as we have seen, is itself uncertain. Moreover, the Company's estimates as to operating expenses in the future were based upon the prices paid for labor, coal, oil, etc., during the latter part of the war, when the prices paid for all such commodities were probably higher than they will be for many years to come.

But the uncertainty by no means ends with these conditions. They in fact tend but to aggravate other uncertainties which exist in connection with the affairs of this Company.

For instance, the Company has a valuable contract with the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company under which it receives a large amount of hydro-electric current at a cost materially less than the cost at which it can itself generate the same. Under the conditions which obtained at the time the exhibits were filed the difference in the cost of steam generated current and hydro-electric current was from one-half to one cent per kilowatt hour. Consequently the saving per million kilowatt hours of current obtained from the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company, upon the above basis, would be from \$5,000 to \$10,000. During the fiscal year 1916 the Company received from the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company 193,428,100 k. w. h. of hydro-electric energy. In the year 1917 it received 173,735,660 k. w. h. During the year 1918 it received 185,296,420 k. w. h., an average of 184,153,393 k. w. h. during the three years. The Company's estimate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, is 172,648,210 k. w. h. This estimate was based largely upon the anticipated requirements of the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company to meet the demands of other contracts, some of which were with industries engaged in the manufacture of war products. If, under conditions now existing, the average of hydro-electric energy received

from the Pennsylvania Company during the past three years should be reached during 1919, the Company would save from \$57,500 to \$115,000 during that year on account of this one item. In addition, the Gas and Electric Company has a number of very large contracts with the United States Government and corporations engaged in the manufacture of munitions and war supplies, the demand from which may reasonably be expected to fall off materially in the near future. In the electrical rate case the Company contended that it should be permitted to charge for this current on the basis of steam generated current, and its fuel rate adjustment allowed by the Commission in that case was predicated upon the assumption that practically all the current furnished by the Company for war purposes would have to be generated by steam. Not all of those contracts by any means will terminate with the actual cessation of the war. What the net results to the Company will be it is impossible to foresee at this time.

When we undertake an analysis of the probable receipts from the Company's gas business, we are confronted by a somewhat similar condition. In addition to its advantageous contract for hydro-electric service with the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company, the Consolidated Company has a valuable contract with the Bethlehem Steel Company for coke-oven gas produced at its Sparrow's Point plant. In some of its exhibits filed in this case the Company estimated that in 1919 the cost of manufactured water gas would be 50.17 cents per thousand cubic feet, whereas the cost of coke-oven gas is estimated to be 11.08 cents per thousand feet, a saving of 39.09 cents per thousand.

During the years 1916, 1917 and 1918, the Bethlehem Steel Company had two batteries of ovens in operation, and from these the Consolidated Company received in 1916, 2,368,530,000 cubic feet; in 1917, 2,697,773,000 cubic feet; in 1918, 2,353,711,000 cubic feet, and estimates that it will receive in 1919, 2,503,900,000 cubic feet. The Bethlehem Steel Company now has in course of construction two new batteries of ovens, one of which is expected to go into complete service by the end of the calendar year 1918 and the other not later than May, 1919. The Commission has recently been informed by representatives of the Consolidated Company that in the recent past it has been receiving much less coke-oven gas than it had expected to receive at this time, but what the quantity received will be after the new batteries go into operation, how much of the gas will be required by the Bethlehem Steel Company for its own purposes, and what will be the heating value of the gas so received, are all questions the answers to which it is impossible for this Commission to foretell under existing conditions with the information before it. We only know that if the Consolidated Company receives as much as one billion cubic feet over its estimates during the current fiscal year, and that if the saving per thousand cubic feet continues to be as great as the Company a short time ago estimated it would be, and the proportions of coke-oven gas and water gas in the mixed gas remain constant, the saving to the Consolidated Company from this source alone would be \$390,900.

With uncertainties such as these arising out of the contracts of the Consolidated Company with the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company and the Bethlehem Steel Company, respectively, overshadowing the entire situation, it would seem idle for this Commission to undertake to make a careful analysis of the many figures in the exhibits bearing upon the questions of operating receipts and expenses. No matter how accurate our estimates as to the future cost of labor and materials might be, or as to the probable future cost of coal, oil or any other commodity entering into the production of gas or electricity, the worth of such calculations might be set entirely at naught by some change of conditions affecting the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company or the Bethlehem Steel Company, or both, by reason of the cessation of the war.

Prognostications as to the probable future results of existing or proposed rates for public service may properly be, and are frequently, necessary in establishing such rates. But such prognostications in order to be made the basis of a valid order by a Public Service Commission or other State regulatory body must be the result of judgment having its foundation on some reasonable basis of fact. Where they are found on their face to be the result of speculation pure and simple, or of vague conjecture, they should not be made the basis of findings determining rates involving substantial rights of the stockholders of the utility on the one hand and of the public on the other.

Nor is the Commission relieved from its responsibility in the premises by the mere acceptance of the testimony of expert witnesses in cases before it, no matter what the professional reputé or personal integrity of such expert witnesses may be, where it clearly appears that such witnesses themselves are basing their testimony mainly upon speculation.

The Commission might well be justified in basing its conclusions as to the probable cost of generating electricity or manufacturing gas under known conditions upon the testimony of experts in the manufacture of electricity or gas. But it by no means follows that because a witness is an expert in the manufacture of electricity or gas, he is an expert whose testimony must be taken as final or conclusive in respect to the effect which the continuance or cessation of the world war will have upon the electrical output of the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company or gas output of the Bethlehem Steel Company.

Consequently in times such as those which now confront us some other method must be found for ascertaining the fair charges to be made for the gas of the Consolidated Company than the estimates and exhibits to which we have above referred.

Fortunately we have some such evidence in the case before us, although we cannot say that it is wholly free from some of the objections above referred to.

The evidence to which we refer is that relating to the actual cost of manufacturing and distributing gas.

As a general proposition it may be stated as a fundamental principle of the law of rate-making that no public service corporation should be required by the order of a State regulatory body to furnish its commodity at less than cost.

Without undertaking an analysis in detail of the several exhibits relating to the actual cost of producing and marketing gas, this Commission is fully satisfied from the evidence that for some time past the Consolidated Company has been selling its secondary-rate gas at materially less than the actual cost of manufacturing and marketing the same, due regard being had to the amount of coke-oven gas actually received, or which may reasonably be anticipated to be received in the future. The Commission is equally well satisfied that the gas sold at the existing primary rates has been sold at a substantial profit to the Company, and will continue to be sold at a substantial profit under conditions which may reasonably be anticipated in the future, especially in view of the reduction in B. T. U. which has hereinbefore been discussed and which will be covered by our order passed pursuant to this opinion.

The existing secondary rates for gas were established by the Company on an extremely low margin of profit for the purpose mainly of increasing this character of business and thereby equalizing its daily load with resulting economies in operation. With the merits or advisability of the business policy of the Company in establishing its own initiative rates lower than the maximum for the above or other somewhat similar reasons, this Commission has nothing to do unless such rates result in undue and unreasonable discrimination against other classes of patrons and tend to incapacitate the Company from rendering adequate service. But when a public utility finds a previously established rate is too low, although reasonable at the time it was established, that for any reason, or combination of circumstances, and applies to this Commission for relief, it is incumbent upon us in establishing a rate to take the place of the one sought to be abandoned, to establish such rate upon a basis which will make it reasonably compensatory to the utility.

After a full review of all the evidence before it upon this point, this Commission has reached the conclusion that the Company is fairly entitled at this time and under existing conditions to increase its existing secondary or equivalent rates from thirty cents to forty-five cents in the case of the thirty cent net rate and from thirty-five cents to fifty cents in the case of the thirty-five cent net rate under the Company's existing respective schedules. Our order will so provide.

In our opinion in case No. 1492 filed August 9, 1918, we said:

"This importance of the Company to the whole people of our city demands not only that it should be kept at all times up to such a point of financial and business efficiency that it will be able to render adequate service to the public at reasonable rates from day to day and week to week, but also that it

be kept at all times beyond reasonable peril of financial embarrassment, and in such a condition financially as to be able successfully to invite outside capital for investment in its stocks, bonds and securities. For a company such as this cannot be permitted to stand still. It must at all times at least keep pace with the growth of the community which it serves. Otherwise the service which is adequate today will become inadequate tomorrow.

"Where such service is adequate and the rates charged therefor reasonable, the mutuality of interest between the stockholders and bondholders on the one hand and the public on the other is as near absolute as it is possible for it in the nature of things to be. It is that mutuality of interest in the property and affairs of our public utilities which it is the purpose of our Public Service Commission Law to promote, and which can only be promoted to the greatest advantage when our utilities are required to render adequate service and the public is required to pay reasonable rates for such service."

The Commission adheres to the views so expressed. In our view, the continuance of the seventy-five cents net primary rate and the allowance of the forty-five and fifty cents net secondary or equivalent rates are reasonable to the public under existing conditions and will yield the Company, when taken into consideration with the increased electrical rates authorized in Case No. 1492, a revenue which will enable it to meet all its reasonable corporate requirements for some time to come. But the very uncertainties to which we have referred throughout this opinion as to what the future may bring forth seem to make it desirable that the Commission should retain some greater and more flexible degree of control over these rates in the future than is ordinarily held in a rate-making case.

Therefore our order establishing the above rates will provide that the Company shall make reports of its operating results to the Commission at relatively short intervals in order that if it be found at any time that these rates together with the other existing rates of the Company are yielding either more or less than a reasonably adequate return to the Company under conditions as they may then exist, such order may be reviewed in these proceedings with the minimum of formality and delay. Likewise it is to be understood that the reduction of the heating standard from 600 to 550 B. T. U. is, upon the part of the Commission, a temporary expedient due entirely to existing conditions growing out of the world war just ended and is designed to aid the Company in meeting the exigencies of such conditions during the period of readjustment which must necessarily follow such war.

An order will be passed accordingly.

ORDER No. 4546.

In the Matter of The Complaint of THE CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE and the Application of Said Corporation for an Order Author- izing It to Increase the Price of Gas.	}	Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1519.
---	---	---

In accordance with the views expressed in the foregoing opinion, and for the reasons therein stated, it is, this twenty-fifth day of November, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of The Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore filed in these proceedings for permission to increase the price, both gross and net, of all gas sold by it at net rates of sixty-five cents or over, ten cents per thousand cubic feet, be and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice to the re-opening of this case as hereinafter provided; and,

IT IS FURTHER Ordered, That the application of said Company for permission to increase the price, both gross and net, of all gas sold by it at secondary or equivalent rates, fifteen cents per thousand cubic feet, is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. That said increased rates shall become effective December 1, 1918, and that in all bills rendered after that date for gas consumed partly in the month of November and partly in the month of December, 1918, the Company shall pro-rate the secondary consumption, if any, between the old and new secondary rates, respectively, on the basis of the number of days' consumption in each of said months.

2. That from and after December 1, 1918, and during the period that this order shall remain effective, as hereinafter provided, said Company shall maintain a single standard based upon the heating value of the gas as expressed in British thermal units per cubic foot, which at any point not less than one mile from the manufacturing plant shall have a monthly average total heating value of not less than 550 B. T. U. with not less than 530 B. T. U. nor more than 570 B. T. U. at any time, the intention of this requirement being to provide for, as nearly as practicable, the uniform heating value of 550 B. T. U. at all times. The average monthly B. T. U. shall be defined as the average of all daily averages during the month. The daily average upon which the monthly average is based shall be the average of all tests made during the calendar day, at least five such tests to be made by the Company at uniform intervals, between the hours of 6 A. M. and 6 P. M., both inclusive. As soon as practicable after the first of each month, the said Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore shall furnish the Commission a statement of the results

of all tests made during the preceding month as above provided. This statement is to be arranged so as to show the number and results of tests made at each hour of each day during which tests were made, the resultant average for each day, and the average for the month, as provided in General Rules F (1) and G of this Commission's Rules and Regulations for Gas Corporations embodied in Orders No. 2282 and No. 2381, as the same now exist or may hereafter be modified from time to time.

3. That within thirty days after December 31, 1918, and thereafter within thirty days after the end of each quarterly period, accounting from December 31, 1918, said Company shall file with the Commission a properly verified statement of its revenues and expenses during the preceding quarter. Upon receipt of such statement or of any other similar statements which said Company may elect to file other than at the end of such quarter, this Commission may, of its own motion, or upon the application of said Company, re-open this case, and, in the light of the evidence contained in the record thereof, taken in connection with the information contained in such statements, or any other evidence or data which may be produced, reconsider all or any of the provisions of this Order, and pass such further order or orders from time to time as may be necessary or proper in the premises.

4. That, in the absence of any such order or orders modifying the provisions hereof, this Order shall remain effective for two years from the date hereof, and thereafter until the further order of this Commission in the premises.

AND IT IS FURTHER ~~Ordered~~, That a copy of this order be served forthwith upon the proper officers of the said Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore, and that said Company within ten days from the date of the service of such copy shall advise this Commission in writing whether or not it will accept and abide by the same.

ORDER No. 4547.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of the PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

vs.

THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY OF BALTIMORE with Respect
to the Fairness and Reasonableness of
Its Proposed General Increase in Its
Passenger Rates.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1583.

Upon petition of The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore and after due consideration, it is this 25th day of November, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That Order No. 1010 entered by this Commission on December 24, 1912, in Case No. 96, same being complaint of Old Frederick Road Improvement Association, et al., vs. The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and Order No. 1430 entered by this Commission on October 20, 1913, in Case No. 579, same being complaint of Louis Knieling, et al., vs. The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, in so far as said orders fix the rates of one way and commutation fares to be charged by The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore in the City of Baltimore and in the counties of Baltimore, Howard and Anne Arundel, be and they are hereby suspended, pending the conclusion of hearings and investigation and the filing of the Commission's findings in Case No. 1583 now pending before this Commission.

AND IT IS FURTHER **Ordered**, That except as hereby suspended, this Commission's Orders Nos. 1010 and 1430 shall be and remain in full force and effect.

ORDER No. 4548.

In the Matter of

The Revision of Circular No. 3-C—Regulations Governing the Reporting of Railroad Accidents.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Ordered, This twenty-sixth day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

(1) That Circular No. 3-C issued by order of this Commission on the twelfth day of August, 1915, be and the same is hereby rescinded.

(2) That the draft of rules entitled "Rules Governing Monthly Reports of Railway Accidents" approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the eleventh day of October, 1918, effective October 1, 1918, be and they are hereby adopted and substituted for rules as set forth in said Circular No. 3-C.

(3) That said rules hereby adopted shall become effective on and after the first day of December, 1918, and the Secretary is hereby directed to procure from the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., a supply of same for the use of this Commission.

ORDER No. 4549.

In the Matter of

The Complaint of THE A. B. COCHRANE COMPANY and More Than One Hundred Other Customers of the Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company Against the Increase in Rates for Electric Current Filed by Said Company May 13, 1918.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1528.

WHEREAS, The A. B. Cochrane Company on its own behalf and as representative of the other complainants in this case has filed its petition praying that the above entitled matter be dismissed.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This twenty-ninth day of November, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the same be, and it is hereby, dismissed without prejudice.

ORDER No. 4550.

In the Matter of

The Petition of the Carriers Not Under Federal Control Named in the Official Classification by R. N. COLLYER, Their Agent, for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Statutory Notice Supplement to Official Classification No. 44 P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, Departing from the Provisions of the Commission's Circular No. 10A So Far as Volume of Supplemental Matter Is Concerned.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 551.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 2nd day of December, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, the carriers not under Federal control named in the Official Classification, by R. N. Collyer, their agent, to file and publish on statutory notice to the Commission and the public, supplement to Official Classification No. 44, P. S. C. Md.—OC No. 44, departing from the provisions of the Commission's Circular No. 10-A in so far as volume of supplemental matter is concerned, including necessary additions to, changes in and eliminations from the list of participating carriers contained in said classification, and re-publishing the classification specifications covering ratings dependent upon declared or agreed values for household goods and emigrants' movables, live wild animals, ores, ostriches, paintings and watches, as set forth in petition herein and accompanying exhibit.

PROVIDED, Said supplement be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4550 of date December 2, 1918."

ORDER No. 4551.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated November 1, 1918, Between It and CHARLES E. STEWART, ET AL., Trading as the Hillsboro Electric Light Company for the Sale by the Former and the Purchase by the Latter of Nine Poles and One Anchor Guy Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1607.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this second day of December, in the year 1918 by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

~~Ordered~~, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4552.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated November 1, 1918, Between It and CHARLES E. STEWART, ET AL., Trading as the Hillsboro Electric Light Company for the Sale by the Former and the Purchase by the Latter of Two Poles Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1608.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the

Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It IS, THEREFORE, On this second day of December, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4553.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Approval of an Agreement Dated November 16, 1918, Between It and JOHN G. REDDEN and ALBERT E. SCHUH, Trading as the Denton Drug Company, for the Leasing by the Former to the Latter of a Portion of Certain Premises on Main Street, Town of Denton, County of Caroline, State of Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 2913, Entered June 20, 1916, in Case No. 1131.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1609.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

It IS, THEREFORE, On this second day of December, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4555.

In the Matter of

The Petition of MARYLAND AND PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY for Permission Under Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Passenger Tariff Establishing One Way Fares for Officers, Enlisted Men and Nurses Discharged from the United States Army, Navy or Marine Corps on Basis of Two-Thirds of the One Way Fare Now Effective.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 552.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 3rd day of December, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad Company to file and publish on one day's notice to the Commission and the public, petitioner's passenger tariff establishing one way fares for officers, enlisted men and nurses, discharged from the United States Army, Navy or Marine Corps.

PROVIDED, Said tariff containing said fares be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said supplement shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4555 of date December 3, 1918."

ORDER No. 4556.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Sale by the Former and the Purchase by the Latter of Six Poles and Four Anchor Guys Near S. A. Tower in the Seventh District of Cecil County, Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 4544, Entered November 22, 1918, in Case No. 1606.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1611.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this sixth day of December, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4560.

In the Matter of

The Application of SUSQUEHANNA TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF MARYLAND for Authority to Issue \$266,000 Par Value of Its First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Bonds for the Lawful Refunding of Its Obligations.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1610.

WHEREAS, The Susquehanna Transmission Company of Maryland has applied to this Commission for authority to issue Two Hundred and Sixty-six Thousand Dollars (\$266,000) of said company's First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Gold Bonds, at ninety per cent. of their par value, in payment of its indebtedness to the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company for advances made to it by the said Pennsylvania

Water and Power Company from November 30, 1914, to August 31, 1918, together with a balance of Eight Hundred and Ninety-six Dollars and Fifty-five cents (\$896.55), covering advances subsequent to October 31, 1913, and prior to November 30, 1914, said bonds being part of a total authorized issue of Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,500,000) secured by mortgage or deed of trust dated March 13, 1911, to the Knickerbocker Trust Company of New York, Trustee, and

WHEREAS, The above entitled application having come on to be heard on December 10, 1918, after due notice published in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4554 passed December 2, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after hearing that the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of said bonds is reasonably required for the purpose of said corporation, to wit: the lawful refunding of its obligations,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 11th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the applicant, Susquehanna Transmission Company of Maryland, be and it is hereby authorized to issue its First Mortgage Five Per Cent. Gold Bonds to the amount of Two Hundred and Sixty-six Thousand Dollars (\$266,000) and to deliver the same to the Pennsylvania Water and Power Company in liquidation of its obligations to that corporation for moneys advanced to August 31, 1918, as set forth in the application herein, said bonds to be issued at not less than ninety per cent. of the par value thereof,

PROVIDED, That each and every of said bonds shall be guaranteed by the said Pennsylvania Water and Power Company in accordance with the opinion of this Commission filed on June 23, 1911, in Case No. 141 and resolution of the Board of Directors of said corporation passed on August 24, 1911.

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered,** That the said Susquehanna Transmission Company of Maryland shall make report to this Commission duly verified by affidavit, as to the fact of the issuance and delivery of said bonds so soon as the same shall have been completed, in accordance with this order.

ORDER No. 4563.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY for the Approval of an Agreement Between It and THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY for the Joint Use by the Former and the Latter of 15 Poles Owned by the Former Located on the Northwest Side of South Division Street, Southwest of Snow Hill Road in the Town of Salisbury, District No. 13, County of Wicomico, State of Maryland, Under the Terms and Provisions of Order No. 4544, Entered November 22, 1918, in Case No. 1606.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1613.

The agreement or other written instrument evidencing the transaction in this case having been submitted to this Commission for the purpose of securing its consent to the consummation thereof and the Commission having determined that a hearing is unnecessary,

IT IS, THEREFORE, On this 17th day of December, in the year 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the consent of this Commission be and the same is hereby given to the disposition of the property described in said agreement, or other written instrument, evidencing the transaction in accordance with the terms outlined therein.

ORDER No. 4565.

In the Matter of

The Joint Petition of the COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, and the MAYOR AND COMMON COUNCIL OF MT. RAINIER for an Order Authorizing the Commissioners of Prince George's County to Cross the Tracks of the City and Suburban Railway at Grade with a Road Approved by the Board of Road Commissioners of Maryland and Now in Process of Construction.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1612.

The above entitled matter having this day come on for hearing in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4561 passed December 11, 1918, and no protests thereto having been made, and the Commission being of the opinion and finding after due hearing that the construction of the grade crossing for which the approval of this Commission is sought is reasonably required for the public convenience,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 18th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the construction of a public highway crossing by the County Commissioners for Prince George's County, Maryland, at grade over the tracks of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington, in the town of Mount Rainier, Maryland, as shown on blueprint filed herein, be and the same is hereby permitted and approved.

ORDER No. 4566.

In the Matter of

The Petition of NORTHERN VIRGINIA POWER COMPANY for Permission to File and Publish on Less Than Statutory Notice Petitioner's Electric Rate Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 6.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

S. N. & R. Docket.

Case No. 553.

The above mentioned petition having been received and filed, upon consideration thereof, it is this 18th day of December, 1918, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That permission be, and is hereby given, Northern Virginia Power Company to file and publish and make effective as of

December 1, 1918, petitioner's electric rate schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 6, such schedule to provide rates for both lighting and power service lower than the rates for similar service in effect immediately prior to December 1, 1918, and in no event higher than the rates in effect immediately prior to said date,

PROVIDED, Said tariff be filed with the Commission upon issuance of this Order, and published by posting as required by law, and that all copies of said tariff shall bear the following notation:

"Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4566 of date December 18, 1918."

ORDER No. 4567.

In the Matter of	
The Complaint of MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL OF KENSINGTON	} Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1592.
vs.	
KENSINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY.	

WHEREAS, This case involving the adequacy of the service furnished by the respondent, Kensington Railway Company, being at issue upon complaint and answer on file, and having been set for hearing on the date hereof by Order No. 4557 passed by the Commission on December 10, 1918, and

WHEREAS, The complainants, by Edgar W. Moore, Mayor of the Town of Kensington, have filed with the Commission a stipulation to the effect that the complaint is withdrawn, conditioned upon the observance by the respondent company of a time-schedule filed with said stipulation, which said time-schedule has been approved by representatives of the complainants and the defendant,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the above entitled case be and it is hereby entered as satisfied and closed.

ORDER No. 4568.

In the Matter of	}	Before the
The Petition of KENSINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY for Permission to Increase Its Rates of Fare.		Public Service Commission of Maryland. Case No. 1593.

Upon consideration of the petition and other papers in the above entitled matter the Commission being of opinion and finding that the fares prescribed by this Commission in its Order No. 3632 entered on May 5, 1917, in Case No. 1290 to be thereafter charged and collected by the petitioner until the further order of this Commission should properly be increased to the basis herein prayed for, in view of the greatly increased cost of operation experienced by the Kensington Railway Company since the date the aforesaid order was entered,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the petitioner, Kensington Railway Company, be and it is hereby authorized and permitted to increase the fares charged by said petitioner for transportation over its line of railway to the following basis:

<i>Between</i>	<i>And</i>	<i>One-Way Fare</i>	<i>Round Trip</i>	<i>12-Ride Tickets</i>	<i>50-Ride Tickets</i>
Chevy Chase Lake	North Chevy Chase	5c.	9c.	45c.	\$1.75
Chevy Chase Lake	End of Ken- sington Railway ..	6c.	11c.	60c.	2.25

PROVIDED, That the petitioner shall file with the Commission at least one day before said increased fares become effective a tariff schedule setting forth said increased fares, as well as all other fares of said petitioner, and the provisions under which all forms of tickets in such schedule provided are sold and honored, said tariff schedule and all copies thereof to bear the following notation:

“Issued under special permission of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order No. 4568 of date December 19, 1918.”

IT IS FURTHER **Ordered,** That this Commission's Order No. 3632 aforesaid entered on May 5, 1917, in Case No. 1290 be and it is hereby modified so as to permit the change in rates by first paragraph of this Order authorized, and to that extent only.

ORDER No. 4569.

In the Matter of

The Application of JAMES A. LACKEY,
F. C. BARNES, S. CANTINEO & BRO.,
INTER-CITY TRANSFER COMPANY, THE
FAST FREIGHT COMPANY and DANTONI
& FERTITTA for Permits for the Opera-
tion of Motor Vehicles for Public Use
Between Baltimore, Maryland, and the
District of Columbia.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1604.

WHEREAS, James A. Lackey having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of motor vehicles for public use in the transportation of freight between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia line, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on December 13, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4559 passed December 10, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of James A. Lackey in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby granted and that the permit applied for be issued between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia line.

ORDER No. 4570.

In the Matter of

The Application of JAMES A. LACKEY,
F. C. BARNES, S. CANTINEO & BRO.,
INTER-CITY TRANSFER COMPANY, THE
FAST FREIGHT COMPANY and DANTONI
& FERTITTA for Permits for the Opera-
tion of Motor Vehicles for Public Use
Between Baltimore, Maryland, and the
District of Columbia.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1604.

WHEREAS, The Inter-City Transfer Company having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of motor vehicles for public use in the transportation of freight between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia line, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on December 13, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4559 passed December 10, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of Inter-City Transfer Company in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby granted and that the permit applied for be issued between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia line.

ORDER No. 4571.

In the Matter of

The Application of JAMES A. LACKEY,
F. C. BARNES, S. CANTINEO & BRO.,
INTER-CITY TRANSFER COMPANY, THE
FAST FREIGHT COMPANY and DANTONI
& FERTITTA for Permits for the Opera-
tion of Motor Vehicles for Public Use
Between Baltimore, Maryland, and the
District of Columbia.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1604.

WHEREAS, Dantoni & Fertitta having made application to this Commission for a permit for the operation of motor vehicles for public use in the transportation of freight between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia line, and

WHEREAS, The application having come on to be heard on December 13, 1918, in accordance with this Commission's Order No. 4559 passed December 10, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the public welfare and convenience require the granting of said permit,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 19th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the application of Dantoni & Fertitta in this case exhibited be, and the same is hereby granted and that the permit applied for be issued between Baltimore, Maryland, and the District of Columbia line.

ORDER No. 4592.

In the Matter of

The Application of THE PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON RAILROAD COMPANY and THE BALTIMORE AND SPARROWS POINT RAILROAD COMPANY for an Order Approving the Acquisition of the Property, Rights, Privileges, Franchises and Credits of The Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company by the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company.

Before the

Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1614.

The petition of The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company and of The Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company for an order of the Commission permitting and approving the acquisition by The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company of the property, rights, privileges, franchises and credits of The Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company and the sale by the latter of the same to the former, upon the terms, stipulations and conditions set out in the agreement between the said two corporations dated November 13, 1918, a copy of which is filed with the petition as Exhibit "E," coming on to be heard; and it appearing to the Commission that due publication of the Commission's order setting the matter down for hearing has been made in accordance with said order; and it further appearing to the Commission that the things for which and of which the Commission's permission and approval are asked, are authorized by law, Section 284-B of Article 23 of the Code of Public General Laws of Maryland; and it further appearing to the Commission from the evidence before it that the things for which and of which the Commission's permission and approval are asked are necessary and convenient for the public service.

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 28th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the permission and approval of the Commission are hereby granted to The Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company to purchase and acquire, and to The Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company to sell and transfer to the former, all the property, rights, privileges, franchises and credits of the said The Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company in accordance with the terms, stipulations and conditions set out in the agreement between the said corporations dated November 13, 1918, a copy of which is filed in these proceedings as Exhibit "E,"

subject, however, in all respects, to the rights of the United States, the President thereof, or the Director General of Railroads incident to or growing out of the taking over of the railroad and property of The Baltimore and Sparrows Point Railroad Company pursuant to the Proclamation of the President of the United States, dated December 26, 1917.

ORDER No. 4593.

In the Matter of

The Application of the POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY for an Order Permitting and Approving the Extension of Its Transmission Lines to the Pump House of the Town of Mt. Rainier in Prince George's County, Maryland.

Before the
Public Service Commission
of Maryland.

Case No. 1615.

WHEREAS, The Potomac Electric Power Company, a body corporate, incorporated under the laws of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, and engaged in the business of furnishing electric current for light, heat and power purposes within the District of Columbia and within the State of Maryland, has applied to this Commission for an Order permitting and approving the exercise by it of the franchise granted it by the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Mt. Rainier, Maryland, by ordinance of said Mayor and Town Council dated December 10, 1918, certified copy of which ordinance is filed in these proceedings marked Exhibit "B" and of the franchise granted it by the County Commissioners of Prince George's County, Maryland, by agreement dated July 6, 1915, certified copy of which agreement is filed in these proceedings marked Exhibit "C," to construct, maintain and operate additional poles, wires, fixtures and other necessary apparatus from a point at or about where the tracks of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington cross the right of way of the Washington, Westminster and Gettysburg Railroad; thence in a northwesterly direction on said right of way to a point where said right of way adjoins Czarra Avenue; thence in a northwesterly direction on Czarra Avenue to a point approximately 70 feet north of the southeast corner of property acquired and owned by the town of Mt. Rainier, in Maryland, and adjoining Czarra Avenue; thence over and across the property of said town in a westerly direction to the pump house of the water system of said town of Mt. Rainier, as shown on blueprint filed in these proceedings marked Exhibit "A," and

WHEREAS, This case having this day come on for hearing after due notice published in compliance with this Commission's Order No. 4573:

passed December 19, 1918, and it being the opinion and finding of the Commission after due hearing that the exercise of such franchises is necessary and convenient for the public service,

IT IS, THEREFORE, This 30th day of December, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Ordered, That the exercise by the Potomac Electric Power Company of the franchise granted it by the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Mt. Rainier, Maryland, by ordinance of said Mayor and Town Council dated December 10, 1913, and of the franchise granted it by the County Commissioners of Prince George's County, Maryland, by agreement dated July 6, 1915, whereby the said Potomac Electric Power Company is authorized to construct, maintain and operate additional poles, wires, fixtures and other necessary apparatus along the route hereinbefore described and also within the corporate limits of the town of Mt. Rainier, Maryland, and also within the County of Prince George's, Maryland, for the sale and furnishing of electrical energy for light, heat and power purposes to persons, property or corporations, within, near or beyond the territory aforesaid as provided by said franchises, be, and the same hereby is, permitted and approved, subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in the ordinance and agreement aforesaid, save in so far as same fix or attempt to fix the rates which shall be charged by the said Potomac Electric Power Company, the exclusive jurisdiction of this Commission in this respect being expressly reserved by this Commission under the terms of the Public Service Commission Law.

APPENDIX III

OPINIONS FILED BY COUNSEL TO COMMISSION

(333)

In the Matter of
The Jurisdiction of the Commission Over
Sewerage Companies.

January 11, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I reply to your communication of the 7th inst., which was accompanied by a copy of a letter dated the 4th inst. from the Cityco Realty Company, by John J. Hurst, president, to you. In the last mentioned letter the writer asked you whether you have jurisdiction over sewerage companies. None, I answer, under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law. Sewerage companies are not among the companies enumerated in that law as intended to be subject to the jurisdiction and authority of the Commission.

By Chapter 804 of the Acts of 1914, approved April 16, 1914, however, it is provided that no owner or occupant of any property in Baltimore County shall be required to connect his premises with any private sewerage system, under the provisions of Section 132-Q of Article 3 of the Code of Public Local Laws of Maryland, title, "Baltimore County," sub-title, "Health and Sanitary Officers," unless the rates and terms for such connections have been approved by the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(834)

In the Matter of The Jurisdiction of the Commission Over Grade Crossings in Cecil County, Md.	}	January 12, 1918.
---	---	-------------------

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I reply to your communication of the 11th inst., asking me to take certain steps on your behalf, in relation to the B. & O. R. R. grade crossings at Elk Mills, Singerly, Leslie and Aiken in Cecil County, Md. These crossings were the subject of the letter of complaint addressed to the Commission on August 24 last by Mr. Thomas J. Murray. I note that the Chief Engineer of the B. & O. R. R. Co. has given his assent to the suggestions for the improvement of the conditions surrounding the crossings, contained in the report of the Engineering Department of the Commission; but, in my judgment, a serious obstacle to the assertion of any authority in the matter of these crossings by the Commission is found in the fact, as shown in the letter of the Chief Engineer of the B. & O. R. R. Co. to the Commission, dated September 28, 1917, which forms a part of the correspondence in this case, that the precautions provided at the present time for the safety of the public in connection with the crossings were all prescribed by orders of the County Commissioners of Cecil County, passed pursuant to the authority conferred upon them by Section 283, of Article 23, of the Code of 1904, now embodied in Section 303, of Article 23, of Bagby's Annotated Code.

The provisions of this legislation give the County Commissioners of the different counties in the State full authority to require railroad companies to protect the safety of the public at grade crossings through the agency of flagmen, electric alarm bells, or safety gates, or by undergrade or overgrade changes. These powers upon the part of the County Commissioners have been recognized as being still in existence by the Court of Appeals of Maryland since the passage of the Public Service Commission Law. (Prince George's County vs. B. & O. R. R. Co., 113 Md., 179, 184.) In this case a special law providing for safety gates and flagmen at two railroad crossings was declared unconstitutional by the Court because covering cases for which provision had already been made by a general law, within the meaning of the State Constitution; that is to say, by Section 283, of Article 23 of the Code of 1904, just cited.

To say the least, therefore, the County Commissioners for Cecil County have full, concurrent jurisdiction with the Public Service Commission in relation to the placing of flagmen, electric bells, or safety

gates, or making undergrade or overgrade changes at the crossings complained of by Mr. Murray; and if any of the agencies or devices required by the orders of the County Commissioners for the safety of the public at these crossings are to be done away with, it appears to me that it should be by the orders of the County Commissioners themselves. In other words, I question the power of the Commission to set aside orders passed by the County Commissioners under the provisions of the General Laws of Maryland in relation to dangerous grade crossings.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

February 21, 1918.

The Public Service Commission,

Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.

Gentlemen:

In the absence of General Counsel Bruce I have been asked for an opinion as to the jurisdiction of the Commission over the Interstate Motor Express Company, Inc., which advertises that it is engaged in operating a line of motor trucks for the transportation of freight for hire between, *inter alia*, Baltimore and Washington, my information being that this company is now engaged in operating a line over the State highway between Baltimore and Washington.

By Chapter 445 of the Acts of 1914 a new section, 1½, was added to the Public Service Commission Law providing that the term "common carrier" when used in the law should likewise include all automobile transportation companies, and all persons and associations of persons, whether incorporated or not, operating automobiles or motor cars, or motor vehicles for public use in the conveyance of persons or property within this State.

By Section 1 of Chapter 714 of the Acts of 1916 it was provided among other things that it should be the duty of each owner of a motor vehicle to be used in the public transportation of merchandise or freight, operating over State, State-aid, improved county roads and streets and roads of incorporated towns and cities in the State of Maryland, to secure a permit from the Public Service Commission of Maryland to operate over said roads and streets, special registration fees being payable by the owners of motor vehicles used in this class of business.

The applicability of these laws to motor vehicles engaged in interstate commerce has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of *Hendrick vs. State of Maryland*, 235 U. S., 610, and *Kane vs. State of New Jersey*, 242 U. S., 161.

In both these cases it was held that, "in the absence of national legislation upon the subject," the power of the State to regulate the use of its highways by motor vehicles moving in interstate commerce applies as well to such as are moving through the State as to such as are moving into it only, and in the latter case it was expressly held that as applied to vehicles of non-residents moving in interstate commerce as well as to vehicles of residents, the amount of the registration fee may properly be based not only on the cost of inspection and regulation, but also on the cost of maintaining improved roads.

Inasmuch as there has been no national legislation on the subject since the decisions in these cases, it would seem clear that the Public Service Commission of Maryland has jurisdiction over this particular company and that it cannot lawfully operate over the State road between Baltimore and Washington without first obtaining a permit from the Commission and complying with the other provisions of Chapter 714 of the Acts of 1916.

Very truly yours,

OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(335)

In Re

Right of PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY to Haul Certain Freight for the United States Government at Reduced Rates.

March 5, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 4th inst., submitting to me for my consideration a copy of a letter dated February 28, 1918, from E. B. Bates, Assistant Freight Traffic Manager of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, to the Commission, in which the writer asks the Commission whether the Pennsylvania Railroad Company is at liberty to deliver certain carload shipments of cinders from Canton and Sparrows Point, Md., to the United States Government at Edgewood, Md., at certain reduced freight rates, without publishing and filing such rates with the Commission.

By the provisions of Section 16 of the Public Service Commission Law, it is provided that no common carrier shall receive a greater, or less, or different compensation for the transportation of freight or

property than the rates specified in its schedules, filed and in effect at the time. But by the express terms of the same Section "the carriage free, or at reduced rates, of property for the United States, State or Municipal Governments" is excepted out of the operation of the Section.

My advice to the Commission, after carefully considering all the circumstances surrounding the letter of Mr. Bates, is to follow, for the present at any rate, the precedent set by Conference Ruling No. 38 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, mentioned in the letter, and to notify Mr. Bates that the reduced rates in the matter of the shipments of the cinders to Edgewood, Md., above mentioned, need not be published and filed.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(336)

In Re

The Jurisdiction of the Commission Over
Public Service Corporations in the
Matter of Nuisances.

March 26, 1918.

Public Service Commission,

Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.

Gentlemen:

I have received your letter of the 26th inst., and the correspondence accompanying it, in relation to the complaint of R. P. German, who resides at No. 133 West Clement Street, that his sleep is very seriously disturbed by the noise emitted from the blowers of the Race Street plant of the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company.

In my judgment, the Commission has no jurisdiction or authority to entertain the complaint. It is not a criminal court, qualified to deal with nuisances of an indictable nature; nor is it a court of chancery, clothed with the power to restrain a continuance of a nuisance by the process of injunction. Assuming that Mr. German has a just cause for complaint, he should resort to the courts for redress.

Unless related in some way to the adequacy or safety of its service, we have no more authority over nuisances committed by the Gas Company than over nuisances committed by an ordinary individual who is not charged with any public service obligations.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(337)

In Re

Complaint of the TOWN COMMISSIONERS

vs.

MARYLAND WATER COMPANY.

March 28, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,**Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 21st inst., accompanied by a copy of a letter, dated the 20th inst., from Mr. William H. Surratt to the Commission, in which he asks: "Has the new Water Company been made a party in the case of the Town Commissioners vs. the Maryland Water Company?"

If Mr. Surratt means by "the new water company" that company that has been proposed to be incorporated for the purpose of taking over the property and assets of the Maryland Water Company purchased by James H. Alexander at the foreclosure sale of this property and these assets, I answer no. The property and assets, so far as I am aware, still stand in the name of James H. Alexander. Of course, until some company or some individual does take them over from him, the Commission is powerless to hold anybody but him to the responsibilities of a water company, under the provisions of the Public Service Commission Law. How far any real gain would follow from an attempt to hold Mr. Alexander responsible as such, Mr. Surratt is doubtless in as good a position to judge as the Commission.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(838)

Jurisdiction of

The Commission in the Matter of Withdrawal of Current and Service Due to Unpaid Bills.

March 28, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your letter of the 26th inst., accompanied by a copy of a letter, dated the 22nd inst., from the Washington Railway and Electric Company to the Washington and Great Falls Railway and Power Company, a Maryland corporation, informing the latter company that unless it pays certain arrearages due, or claimed to be due, by it to the former company within the period of ten days the service now being rendered by the former company to the latter company will be suspended.

To say nothing more, the Commission, it is hardly necessary to declare, has no power to compel any company, whether a Maryland public service corporation or not, to continue its services to a consumer that does not pay its bills.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(339)

Query of

C. P. CLOSE as to the Use of Intrastate and Interstate Tickets in Making One Interstate Trip.

March 28, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your letter of the 27th inst., with its accompanying enclosures, including a letter dated the 15th inst. from Mr. C. P. Close, of College Park, Md.

What Mr. Close desires, as I understand it, is to use the reduced family ticket intrastate fare between College Park and Riverdale on the line of the City and Surban Railway Company of Washington in combination with the reduced interstate commutation fare between

Riverdale and the City of Washington, and to thereby secure for himself for the whole distance between College Park and that city a lower fare than the reduced interstate commutation fare for the whole distance between College Park and the City of Washington.

In my judgment, Mr. Close cannot lawfully piece out any such patch-work combination rate. Under the circumstances, his transit over the entire distance between College Park and Washington is governed by the rate fixed by the paramount authority of the Interstate Commerce Law. This transit is an entire indivisible unit, and he cannot escape the legal consequences that attach to an interstate movement by attempting to assume the character of an intrastate passenger for a part of the whole distance over which the movement extends.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(340)

Inquiry of

The EVERGREEN LAWN LAND AND IMPROVEMENT COMPANY as to Formality Necessary to Discontinue Business as a Water Company.

April 16, 1918.

Public Service Commission,

Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.

Gentlemen:

I have received your letter of the 12th inst., which was accompanied by a copy of a letter, dated the 10th inst., from William L. Rawls, the attorney for the Evergreen Lawn Land and Improvement Company, to you.

Mr. Rawls states that his client wishes to discontinue the business of supplying water at Hamilton after July 1, 1918; and the purpose of your letter, as I understand it, is to ask me whether it can do this without the approval of the Commission.

Assuming that the right of the Company to supply water at Hamilton was never exercised before the passage of the Public Service Commission Law, that is to say before April 5, 1910, the date when that law was approved, the Company, in my opinion, will not be legally warranted in discontinuing its operations after July 1, 1918, without first obtaining the authority of the Commission to do so. Such

approval is made necessary as to common carriers by the provisions of Section 26 of the Public Service Commission Law, and these provisions of this Section are made applicable to water companies, by reference, by Section 42 of the same law.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(341)

In the Matter of

A Group of Individuals Starting to Work
as an Electrical Corporation Prior to
Incorporation and Without Securing
the Approval of the Public Service
Commission of Maryland.

May 22, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 13th inst., submitting to me a copy of a letter from Charles A. Hawkins to the Commission, dated May 11, 1918.

Mr. Hawkins asks you whether certain individuals, in advance of the actual incorporation of an electrical corporation that is proposed to be formed in the State of Pennsylvania for the purpose of supplying light, heat and power at Fawn Grove, York County, Pa., and in its vicinity, can begin certain construction work and erect certain poles on public highways within the State of Maryland, for the benefit of the projected corporation, without first obtaining the consent of the Public Service Commission.

In my judgment, they cannot. By Section 33 of the Public Service Commission Law it is provided that no electrical corporation, incorporated under the laws of this or any other State, shall begin construction, or exercise any right or privilege under any franchise subsequent, in point of time, to the enactment of that law without first having obtained the permission and approval of the Commission. And by Section 1 of the same law, it is declared that the term "electrical corporation" in the law shall include individuals as well as corporations.

It is true that Section 33 declares:

"Before such certificate (that is to say, the order of approval by the Commission) shall be issued a certified copy of the charter of such corporation shall be filed in the office of the Commission,"

and that individuals, as distinguished from corporations, have no charter. And it is also noticeable besides, that Section 33 commences with the words, "no gas corporation or electrical corporation *incorporated under the laws of this or any other State* shall begin construction, etc." In my judgment, however, the context of Section 33 is not sufficiently restrictive to limit the scope of the definition of an "electrical corporation" contained in Section 1. Otherwise, as respects the beginning of construction at any rate, the corporation could escape the obligation imposed upon it by Section 33 of securing the approval of the Commission before beginning construction by postponing its actual incorporation until its promoters had begun or even completed construction.

Truly yours,
W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(342)

In the Matter of	}	May 24, 1918.
Jurisdiction Over Holes and Ruts in County Roads.		

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 23rd inst., enclosing a letter from J. P. Connor, manager of the United States Asphalt Refining Company, to you, dated the 22nd inst.

Mr. Connor complains that the roadway under the B. & O. R. R. bridge at Stone House Cove, in Anne Arundel County, was so full of water on the morning of the 22nd inst. as to be impassable.

This grievance does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. Mr. Connor should apply to the administrative agency that is charged with the supervision and care of the public roads in Anne Arundel County.

Truly yours,
W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(343)

Effect of

General Order No. 28 of the Director-General of Railroads Upon the Jurisdiction of the Commission as Respects Railroad and Steamship Lines.

May 29, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have examined General Order No. 28 bearing date May 25, 1918, issued by the Hon. William G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads, and his telegram bearing date May 26, 1918, to your chairman.

You asked me a day or so ago, you will remember, to state the effect, in my opinion, of the order in question.

Its effect, in my judgment, is to transfer to the President of the United States, acting through the Director General of Railroads, and to the Interstate Commerce Commission all the jurisdiction and authority which you have heretofore exercised over the freight rates, passenger fares and baggage charges of railroad and steamship lines within the State of Maryland. The order is applicable alike to both interstate and intrastate class and commodity freight rates, and to both interstate and intrastate passenger fares (including commutation fares) and baggage charges; and by its terms it becomes effective June 25, 1918, as to freight rates, and June 10, 1918, as to passenger fares and baggage charges.

The practical effect of the order will be to operate "substantial"—to use the adjective of the Director General of Railroads—increases in practically all freight rates and passenger fares, interstate and intrastate.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(344)

Complaint as to the Use of Steamboat
Landing at Tilghman, B. C. & A. Rail-
way.

June 6, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 5th inst., which was accompanied by a copy of a letter from the Tilghman Canning Company to you, dated the 3rd inst., complaining that the B., C. & A. Railway Company will not allow them to land their freight out of power boats and sailing craft at its steamboat wharf at Tilghman.

Assuming that this wharf is maintained by the Railway Company solely for the purpose of receiving and discharging freight in the transaction of its own business, I cannot see any foundation for the complaint. As I understand it, the Railway Company uses the landing merely as an incident to the conduct of its own transportation operations. The landing therefore is its own private property, used for the benefit merely of that part of the general public which constitutes its own patrons. If it were holding out the use of the landing for hire to the public generally, its legal relations to the Tilghman Canning Company would be entirely different. But such, I understand, as I have said, is not the case. If my impression is unfounded, I should be glad to have my mind disabused.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(345)

Question as to the Right of the HAGERS-
TOWN AND FREDERICK RAILWAY COM-
PANY to Increase Its Rate Within the
City of Hagerstown.

June 21, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I reply to your letter of the 20th inst., which was accompanied by a letter from T. C. Wester, Naval Inspector of Ordnance, to the Commission, dated the 18th inst., in which the writer calls attention to the increase of rates by the Hagerstown and Frederick R. R. Company

from a 5-cent straight fare to a 7-cent straight fare within the limits of the city of Hagerstown, and states that he has been informed that the franchise granted by the city of Hagerstown to the Railway Company was conditioned upon a 5-cent fare.

Whether, under the circumstances, the 7-cent rate is legal is the inquiry of the letter.

In my opinion, the former 5-cent rate of the Railway Company was superseded, even though prescribed by the franchise ordinance, when, exercising the powers conferred upon it by Section 15 of the Public Service Commission Law, the Railway Company filed a tariff schedule with the Public Service Commission increasing the rate from 5 cents to 7 cents. *Yeatman vs. Public Service Commission*, 126 Md., 513. *Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co., vs. Mottley*, 219 U. S., 467.

Any interested person, however, is at liberty to file a complaint with the Commission impeaching the reasonableness of the increased rate, and asking the Commission to prescribe a reasonable maximum rate for the service.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel

(346)

Validity of

Power Term Contracts, Executed After
the Passage of the Public Service Com-
mission Law.

June 26, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

You have asked me orally to state how far, in my opinion, you will be bound by the several written contracts for term power rates entered into between the Hess Steel Corporation, the Baltimore Dry Docks and Shipbuilding Company, the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company and other corporations, on the one hand, and the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company on the other, when you come to dispose of the complaints of the former companies against the Electric Company, alleging that the increases operated in the rates fixed by the contracts by the new industrial power rates, recently filed with the Commission by the Electric Company, are excessive, unjust and unreasonable, as well as when you come to dispose of your own complaint alleging that these increases are excessive, unjust, unreasonable and discriminatory, and of your own special complaint alleging

that the rates fixed by the particular contract between the Baltimore Copper Smelting and Rolling Company and the Electric Company are unlawful, unjust, unreasonable and discriminatory.

In a legal sense, in my judgment, the hand of the Commission in dealing with these contracts, or so-called contracts, will be entirely unfettered, though the Commission might well stop for a moment, I think, to ask whether the Electric Company did not overlook obvious principles of candor and fair dealing when it published the term industrial power rates, which it has now cancelled, in language well calculated to create in the mind of an individual, or a business concern, not actually familiar with the Laws of Maryland, the impression that it was competent for the Electric Company to enter into a binding contract to furnish him or it with electric power at a fixed rate for a definite period of time. All of the contracts were entered into subsequent to the enactment of the Public Service Commission Law, and the creation of the Commission. All of them, therefore, were formed subject in every respect to the police jurisdiction over the rates of electric companies delegated to the Commission by the Public Service Commission Law. "Contracts even as between individuals," said the Court of Appeals of Maryland in *Yeatman vs. Towers*, 126 Md., 513, "when entered into are necessarily subject to the control of the police power of the State whenever such contract relates to matters which are or may be subject to the exercise of such powers" (p. 518.) In the *Yeatman* case, a special water rate provided for by a contract consummated before the passage of the Public Service Commission Law was held to have been abrogated by the action of the Commission in ordering a new schedule of water rates. "The right to regulate rates for which water will be supplied," the Court further said in this case (p. 517), "is in its nature the execution of one of the powers of the State of which it can no more divest itself than it can part with its powers of taxation." *A fortiori*, of course, this right is applicable also to contracts for water or electric rates formed after the passage of the Public Service Commission Law.

I entertain no doubt that if, in the opinion of the Commission, the new industrial power rates of the Electric Company are just and reasonable it is authorized to declare them so, despite the contracts above mentioned, and to thereby establish them as applicable to the consumers who are parties to those contracts; or that, if in its opinion these rates are excessive, unjust, unreasonable or discriminatory it is authorized to declare them so, leaving the published rates on which the contracts are based in force. So far as the authority of the Commission over rates is concerned, the contracts have no restraining efficacy at all. The contractual form which has been attempted to be given to the rates mentioned in these writings is mere drapery, which it can push aside at pleasure. Any other conclusion would, in my opinion, be repugnant not only to the paramount nature of the police powers and to the direct letter of the Public Service Commission Law, but also to the leading purposes of that law. One of its main objects

was to procure adequacy of service from electric companies for the public; and adequate service electric companies cannot give unless they have adequate income, and they might well be deprived of adequate income and, in consequence, the public of adequate service, if they could barter away power at fixed term rates beyond the control of the Commission. Such a rate might be adequate enough for the purposes of adequacy of service at the beginning of a contract term of three or five years, but become materially or totally inadequate for the purposes of adequacy of service before the end of the term, because of radical disturbances in economic conditions worked by the enhanced cost of labor or of supplies, due to a strike, insurrection or war, or some other cause. Corporations of a purely private nature may well be left to protect themselves against such hazards in such ways as may be open to them, but an electric company is a public service agency charged with duties of high import to the public, and it is of vital concern to the public that its ability to render adequate service at all times to the public should be safeguarded by the power of the Commission to allow it at any time to exact any maximum rate that the Commission may reasonably believe to be necessary to render it competent, despite any and all passing economic disturbances, to give to the public the adequate service to which the public is entitled.

Another main object of the Public Service Commission Law was to terminate the unjust—if not scandalous—discriminations in the matter of rates as between different patrons of public service corporations, which had brought so much well-deserved odium upon the administration of such corporations. Under the operation of the law, it was intended that there should be no differences in rates as between shippers or consumers, except such as might be justly founded upon classifications of shippers or consumers suggested by real dissimilarities of situation and needs. This intention would be frustrated if an electric company were at liberty to enter into three or five year contracts for a fixed rate with some of its patrons, and afterwards to file with the Commission a schedule fixing a higher rate for future applications for exactly the same service. The effect of clothing an electric company with such a power would be, it seems to me, to create two classes of patrons separated from each other by none but wholly unreasonable, not to say invidious, principles of distinction. From the very nature of the mischiefs inherent in the discrimination at which the Public Service Commission Law was largely aimed, it seems to me that no differences between the patrons of an electric company based merely upon the fact that some enjoy fixed rates evidenced by written term contracts, and some do not, can be countenanced by the Commission. It is true that in the recent case of *Re New York Steam Company*, P. U. R. 1918-B (advance sheets No. 4), p. 866, it has been decided by one of the New York Public Service Commissions that the holders of existing and unexpired contracts of a heating company may be made the subject of a separate and lawful classification, as distinguished from consumers who have become entitled to the same service under a

higher rate schedule published after the execution of the contracts. But if this decision did not turn upon the fact that there is in the New York Statute relating to heating companies a distinct recognition of written rate agreements as binding contracts, which is not found in the provisions of the Maryland Public Service Commission Law relating to electric companies, it is, in my judgment, a decision that does not furnish a safe and proper precedent for the guidance of the Public Service Commission of Maryland; for it is manifestly in conflict with *Yeatman vs. Towers, supra*, the view which the Commission has repeatedly taken of the relations between its rate making powers and rates resting upon contracts between public service corporations and the citizen, and the utterances of the Supreme Court of the United States in such cases as the *Louisville and Nashville Railway Company vs. Mottley*, 219 U. S., 467, and the *Armour Packing Company vs. U. S.*, 209 U. S., 56.

If in the history of the Public Service Commission of Maryland there has ever been any disposition on its part to except special rate contracts entered into before the enactment of the Public Service Commission Law from the provisions of that law relating to the publication of rates by public service corporations, and the regulation of rates by the Commission, it should be borne in mind that it was at a time when the Commission and its General Counsel did not have the light, in the exercise of their respective functions, which was afterwards supplied by the decision in *Yeatman vs. Towers, supra*, and other decisions of the Court of Appeals of Maryland.

Whether the mere filing of a higher electric rate with the Commission by an electric company operates *ipso facto* a cancellation of prior term contract rates, such as are involved in the pending controversy, is a point that I deem it unnecessary for me to pass upon for the purposes of the inquiry which has been referred to me by you. These term contracts have been actually drawn into controversy in the present proceeding by the attack made by the Commission itself upon the new industrial rates that are intended to supersede the rates prescribed by them. It is sufficient for me to say, as I have already said, that, so far as the Commission is concerned, they furnish no reason why the Commission should not be as free to uphold or strike down the new industrial power rates as if an attempt had never been made by the parties to them to endow them with the validity of binding term contracts.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(347)

Withdrawal of

Electric Rates After Filing.

July 2, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your letter of the 24th ult., together with a copy of the letter from the Municipal Electric Light Plant, of the City of Hagerstown, to you, dated the 22nd ult.

The Municipal Electric Light Plant says it wishes to withdraw at once the Metered Lighting Rates P. S. Md. No. 6, filed with the Commission on May 24th last, and expressed to become effective June 25, 1918, and to continue in effect Lighting Rates P. S. Md. No. 1, which were intended to be cancelled by Schedule No. 6, until the Municipal Lighting Plant can complete a revision, which it has in contemplation, of this branch of its lighting rates.

The conditions under which gas and electric rate schedules must be filed with the Commission and can alone be altered are prescribed by Order No. 246 of the Commission, dated April 19, 1911. By the terms of this Order gas and electric companies are required to make and file with the Commission, and to print and keep open to public inspection, schedules showing the rates and charges for their service; and by further terms of the same order, it is provided that unless the Commission otherwise orders no change shall be made in any rate or charge, which shall have been filed by any gas or electric company, except after thirty days' notice to the Commission, which shall plainly state the changes proposed to be made in the schedule then in force, and the time when the changed rate or charge will go into effect; that all proposed changes shall be shown by printing, filing and publishing new schedules, or shall be plainly indicated upon the schedules in force at the time and kept open to public inspection; and that the Commission, for good cause shown, may allow changes in such rates or charges without requiring the thirty days' notice, by duly filing, in such manner as it may direct, an order specifying the change so made and the time when it shall take effect; all such changes to be immediately indicated upon its schedules by the gas or electric company concerned.

In my opinion, Metered Lighting Rates P. S. Md. No. 6 of the Municipal Lighting Plant of the City of Hagerstown has taken full effect, and can properly be made the subject of an order of the Commission allowing the alteration, which is now proposed to be made in it by a return to the schedule that it was intended to supplant, without requiring the thirty days' notice mentioned in the order of the Commission of April 19, 1911, above referred to.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(348)

Jurisdiction of

The Commission in the Matter of a Complaint by a Citizen of Improper Treatment at the Hands of the Employees of the W., B. & A. Railway.

July 2, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I hereby acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 13th ult., together with the letter from Mrs. M. Pisani to the Commission, dated June 2, 1918, in which she states that she was twice told by the agent of the W., B. & A. Railway Company, at the corner of Eutaw and Pratt Streets, Baltimore City, that she would be entitled to enter Camp Meade without a pass, but could not do so when she reached the Camp because of the lack of one; which was true also of other persons who attempted to enter the Camp on the same day. The writer further says that when she called upon the General Passenger Agent of the Railway Company and asked for the return of her money, he said that he could do nothing for her, and added: "You had a good ride."

Assuming that Mrs. Pisani was a victim of deceitful representations at the hands of the ticket agent of the Railway Company, and also assuming that she received the flippant or ill-natured reply from the General Passenger Agent of the Railway Company that she says she did receive, I think her case is one that unquestionably calls for the action of the Commission in some form or other. Of course, until the complaint has been fully investigated I have no right to express an opinion as to how far the allegations of the complainant are well-founded. It may be that the Railway Company will pointedly deny them or explain them away.

All I can say is that if the Railway Company has a ticket agent conscienceless enough to make false representations to women for the purpose of earning a little more money for the company at their expense, or a General Passenger Agent with too limited a sense of his obligations to the traveling public to refrain from wantonly wounding the feelings of one of their number by ill-timed pleasantry, more or less acidulated with malice, the Commission may well ask whether such a Railway Company is rendering adequate service to the public.

In my judgment, the Railway Company should be required to answer in this case, and to exculpate itself from the accusations that have been made against it by Mrs. Pisani.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(349)

Jurisdiction of

The Commission in the Matter of Receipt
of Beer at Brome's Wharf, St. Mary's
County, via M., D. & V. Ry. Co.

July 2, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 1st inst., together with the accompanying correspondence between Mr. Carroll B. Blick and the Commission.

Mr. Blick complains that the M., D. & V. Railway Company refuses to receive on one of its steamboat lines at Baltimore for delivery at Brome's Wharf, in St. Mary's County, beer, which he desires for family use. The Railway Company alleges that Brome's Wharf is not owned by it, but by Mrs. J. T. Brome, who, in consideration of a compensation paid her by the Company, permits it to use the wharf as a place for taking on and discharging passengers and freight; and acts as its local agent in that connection. The Company further alleges that Mrs. Brome has served notice upon it that she will no longer receive or be responsible for deliveries of liquor. The fact that the presence of liquor in the warehouse on the wharf has actually incited thievery or housebreaking in one instance, and the fact that there is a female seminary within 500 yards of the wharf appear to be the considerations which have impelled Mrs. Brome to take the stand she does.

Under the laws of Maryland the Public Service Commission is given jurisdiction and authority over transportation companies, but none over wharfingers. No evidence has been laid before me to convince me that the understanding between the Railway Company and Mrs. Brome is such, in point of nature and duration, as to lawfully preclude her from refusing to allow shipments of liquor to pass over her wharf; and it seems to me further that any redress to which Mr. Blick may be entitled should be worked out not through the agency of the Commission in the exercise of its powers over the Railway Company, but through the agency of the courts in the exercise of their powers (if any such there be in this particular case) over controversies between private individuals.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(350)

Validity of

Ordinance Specifying the Rate of Fare
for the HAGERSTOWN AND FREDERICK
RAILWAY COMPANY.

July 12, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 12th inst. The case presented to me by it is this: The City of Hagerstown protests against the allowance by you to the Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company of any increased passenger rate within the corporate limits of the city; this protest being based upon the fact that by the Acts of 1892, Chapter 126, the City of Hagerstown was authorized to grant the use of its highways to any street railway company and to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which the use should be exercised; and upon the further fact that the City, pursuant to the Act just mentioned, did grant to the corporate predecessor of the Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company and its successors the right to construct and operate a street railway on certain of its highways; and did, by the terms of this grant, which was evidenced by an ordinance, provide that the fare to be charged to each passenger over the age of 6 years from any point on the railway line was not to exceed 5 cents. The date of the grant was March 12, 1896.

In my opinion, the Public Service Commission has the power, in the exercise of the authority conferred upon it by the Public Service Commission Law, to fix the maximum rate of the Hagerstown and Frederick Railway Company for the carriage of each passenger over the age of 6 years within the corporate limits of the City of Hagerstown at a sum in excess of 5 cents, if such increased fare would, in its judgment, be just and reasonable.

In my opinion, all contracts fixing the rates of common carriers, whether entered into between an individual and a common carrier, or a municipal corporation and a common carrier, and whether entered into prior or subsequent to the enactment of the Public Service Commission Law on April 5, 1910, are subject to the police power, in relation to the rates of common carriers and other public service corporations, delegated to the Public Service Commission by the Public Service Commission Law.

Manigault vs. Spring, 199 U. S., 473.

Armour Packing Co. vs. U. S., 209 U. S., 56.

L. & N. Rwy. Co. vs. Mottley, 219 U. S., 467.

Gregg vs. Laird, et al., 121 Md., 1.

Yeatman vs. Towers, et al., 126 Md., 513.

In the last case, referring to a contract for a special water rate entered into before the enactment of the Public Service Commission Law, the Court of Appeals of Maryland said (p. 517): "The right to regulate rates for which water will be supplied is in its nature the execution of one of the powers of the State of which it can no more divest itself than it can part with its power of taxation." The application of these words to the rates of common carriers, as well as to the rates of water companies, is too obvious for elaboration.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(851)

Form of

Approval on the Part of the Commission of Bond Issues of Public Service Corporations.

July 16, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have examined the proposed form of bond in the matter of the proposed Washington Suburban Sanitary District issue of \$50,000 bonds.

As I have frequently said to the Commission, I do not conceive it to be either the duty of the Commission or of its General Counsel to approve corporate trust mortgages, or forms of corporate bonds and coupons. Under the terms of the Public Service Commission Law, the powers of the Commission in the matter of issues of stocks, bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness proposed to be issued by Public Service Corporations are limited to the determination of the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the proposed issue, and to the certification by the Commission that, in its opinion, the use of the capital to be secured by the proposed issue is reasonably required for one of the purposes named in the Public Service Commission Law.

In my opinion, the powers of the Commission under the special provisions of Chapter 122 of the Acts of 1918, by which the proposed bond issue of the Washington Suburban Sanitary District is authorized, are no greater. I do not think, therefore, that the order of the Commission approving this issue should include the approval of the forms of bonds and coupons submitted to the Commission and me by the Counsel for the Washington Suburban Sanitary District. I have,

however, examined these forms and there is nothing in them, so far as I can see, of a sufficiently unusual or extraordinary nature to have any material bearing upon the question as to whether the proposed bond issue is or is not reasonably required for the purposes for which it is proposed to be used.

Mr. Charles McHenry Howard, one of the Counsel of the Washington Suburban Sanitary District, asks that a certified copy of your order approving the issue be sent to him by your Secretary, and I hope you will see that this is done.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(352)

Reference to

The Segregation of White and Colored
Passengers on the W., B. & A. Electric
Railway Line.

July 17, 1918.

Public Service Commission,

Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 16th inst., which was accompanied by the complaint which Dr. William H. Wright has filed with the Commission, alleging that the W., B. & A. Electric Railway Company "has been and is now endeavoring by various means to inaugurate a system of separation, or segregation, of its white and colored passengers, at times forcing colored people, entitled to first-class transportation from Baltimore City to points beyond the State of Maryland, to travel in cars other than those provided for its other passengers."

In my opinion, this complaint does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. In the case of *Hart vs. State*, 100 Md. 595, the Court of Appeals of Maryland held that Chapter 109, of the Acts of 1904, which provided for the separation of white and colored passengers on railroad lines within the State of Maryland, but did not discriminate between interstate and intrastate passengers, was invalid as to interstate passengers and should not be construed as applying to them (p. 615). Quoting with approval the language of Justice Brown in *L. N. O. & T. Rwy. Co. vs. Mississippi*, 133 U. S., 587, the Court said (p. 609): "Obviously, whether interstate passengers of one race should in any portion of their journey be compelled to share their cabin and accommodations with colored passengers, was a question of interstate commerce and to be determined by Congress alone."

Manifestly, if the General Assembly of Maryland itself had not power to work such compulsion, it was impotent to confer such a power upon the Public Service Commission, and, in my judgment, it has not attempted to do so.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(353)

July 18, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

You ask me whether the passage of Chapter 402 of the Acts of 1918, repealing and re-enacting with amendments Section 21 of Chapter 180 of the Acts of 1910, makes it necessary for the Commission to pass another order or orders approving anew the forms heretofore adopted by the Commission for the annual reports of public service corporations subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

I answer no. The only changes operated by Chapter 402 of the Acts of 1918 are these: It requires the Commission to furnish blank forms for the annual reports of such corporations on or before December 31 in each year, instead of on or before June 30 in each year, as formerly; it also requires the annual reports of common carriers to be filed on or before the 31st day of March in each year, instead of on or before the 30th day of September in each year as formerly; it also provides for the first time that the annual reports of public service corporations subject to the authority of the Commission shall be made for the period of 12 months ending December 31 in each year; it also brought to an end the pre-existing provision of law requiring one-fourth of any amount recovered by the Commission, in the name of the State of Maryland, for a default on the part of a public service corporation in rendering an annual report, or answering questions put to it by the Commission, to be paid to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore.

It is well settled in this State that where the subsequent law re-enacts substantially the same provisions the continuity of the original law as to those provisions is not interrupted. (Swann vs. Kemp, 97 Md., 686, 691, and other Maryland cases there cited.)

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(354)

Status of	}	July 22, 1918.
Automobiles Running Between Belair and Aberdeen.		

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 18th inst., referring to me for an opinion the original complaint of H. M. Hopkins against Charles Wildason, and the correspondence connected therewith.

Mr. Hopkins is the owner of a motor vehicle used in the public transportation of passengers for hire, which he operates on the State road between Belair and Aberdeen; and for the privilege of thus operating this motor vehicle he has obtained the necessary permit from the Public Service Commission and has paid the proper license fee fixed by law. Mr. Wildason is employed at the Aberdeen Federal Proving Ground, as well as five other individuals whose homes, as is his, are in or in the vicinity of Belair. He owns a large touring car for which he has taken out a license as a hiring car, and he makes a daily practice when he starts out for Aberdeen each day of taking up these five individuals in his car for hire, and conveying them as far as Aberdeen, where he lets them out and turns off to his own particular place of employment; and of taking the same individuals up again in the afternoon, as a part of his agreement with them, and of reversely over the same route conveying them to the points from which they started in the morning.

In my opinion, Mr. Wildason is engaged, as Mr. Hopkins is, in the public transportation of passengers for hire over a State road, within the meaning of Chapter 199 of the Acts of 1918; and is operating his vehicle over a fixed route and on a fixed schedule without having first secured a permit from the Public Service Commission to so operate it, and without having first paid the higher license fee to the Commission of Motor Vehicles, which is a prerequisite to the operation of such a vehicle; and, therefore, he should be restrained by injunction by the Commission from prosecuting the unlawful business which he is now pursuing.

He is running upon a fixed route, namely, over the State road between Belair and Aberdeen. He is running upon a schedule just as much fixed by the regular hours that the terms of employment upon which he and his passengers are employed require him and them to keep as if it were fixed by a published schedule; and the circumstance that he himself, as well as each of his passengers, is drawn to the Aberdeen Proving Ground each day by the fact of being employed there is, in my judgment, but a negligible incident of the business in

which he is, concurrently with his employment by the Proving Ground, engaged, of transporting passengers for hire over a fixed route and on a fixed schedule.

Mr. Wildason does not pretend that he is transporting his five daily companions gratuitously, or as a mere matter of friendship or neighborly good feeling. He transports them for hire, and transports them in a large touring car, such as he would hardly use for conveying merely himself from Belair to Aberdeen and from Aberdeen to Belair, and I see no legal difference between transporting only the same five individuals from day to day over such a fixed route for hire and transporting such fluctuating numbers of patrons supplied by the general traveling public as may present themselves for transportation from day to day. In the long run five certain passengers day in and day out might well be a more constant source of income to the owner of a smaller car than an indefinite number of merely potential passengers from day to day might be to the owner of a larger car. It is manifest that Mr. Wildason has all of his arrangements so organized as to enjoy the privilege, on a limited but evidently satisfactory scale, of sharing in the profits of Mr. Hopkins, without paying a license fee as onerous as that which Mr. Hopkins pays. If it is true, as Mr. Wildason says, that the hours of business imposed on his five passengers by their terms of employment at the Proving Ground are such as to render unavailable to them the accommodation afforded by the motor vehicle of Mr. Hopkins, that is a good reason why the exclusive privilege which the Commission may be disposed to accord to Mr. Hopkins should be modified *pro tanto*; but it is no reason why Mr. Wildason should be permitted to transport passengers over a State road for hire, without first securing the proper permit from the Commission, and first paying to the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles the higher license fee prescribed by law.

The case laid before you by Mr. J. W. Peterson in his letter of the 9th inst., which accompanied your communication to me, asserts a somewhat stronger claim upon your consideration than the case made out by Mr. Wildason, but he, too, in my judgment, must apply to the Commission for a permit and pay the higher license fee to the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles; for he, too, in my judgment, is transporting passengers for hire over a State road on a fixed route and a fixed schedule.

What I say about Messrs. Wildason and Peterson would seem to be equally applicable to Emanuel Hagel Schucks, who is also mentioned in the complaint of Mr. Hopkins as operating a motor vehicle between Belair and Aberdeen.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(355)

August 8, 1918.

*The Public Service Commission,
Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th inst., enclosing a letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Company under date of August 1, 1918, and requesting me, in the absence of General Counsel Bruce, for an opinion in the premises.

The Electric Company, which is a District of Columbia corporation and operating mainly therein, desires to know whether or not it is necessary for it to have the approval of this Commission in the case of a proposed bond issue, which has heretofore been approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and by the Capital Issues Committee.

On June 26, 1911, General Counsel Bruce in his opinion No. 69 in the matter of the application of the Crisfield Light and Power Company, a Delaware corporation, to issue bonds (P. S. C. of Md. Reports, Vol. II, p. 478) stated that such approval was not necessary in the case of a foreign corporation.

The Potomac Electric Power Company operates partly in the State of Maryland, and reports to this Commission as by law required. It now proposes to submit to this Commission a statement or report respecting the issue and sale of the bonds proposed to be issued. Such statement or report will suffice for the purposes of the Commission's accounting department, and will be all that is necessary under the circumstances.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(356)

August 19, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Dear Sirs:

I am in receipt of your Secretary's letter of August 12, 1918, requesting my opinion in the absence of General Counsel Bruce upon the question raised by Walter F. MacNeal & Co. in their letter to the Commission of August 10, 1918. The writer of the latter letter asks to be advised whether or not the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City is still under the jurisdiction and control

of this Commission with respect to matters of service rendered its patrons. MacNeal & Co. refer in very general terms to the alleged inadequacy of such service, but make no specific complaint.

By resolution of Congress effective August 1, 1918, the President of the United States was authorized during the continuance of the present war, whenever he should deem it necessary for the national security or defense, to supervise or to take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, such control, when assumed, to continue only to the date of the ratification of a treaty of peace.

My information is that this control has not yet been assumed by the President of the United States to the extent of undertaking the actual operation of the property of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Baltimore City.

Under these conditions, the jurisdiction of this Commission over the service rendered by said Company to its patrons in this State still continues, in my opinion.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(357)

August 19, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Dear Sirs:

I have before me for reply your Secretary's letter of August 12, 1918, requesting me in the absence of General Counsel Bruce to give you an opinion upon certain points as to the jurisdiction of this Commission raised in the letter of counsel for the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company under date August 10, 1918, in the matter of the complaint of A. G. Campbell against said Company.

Although I have not been furnished copies of all the correspondence in this matter, it seems that Mr. Campbell complained to the Commission of an alleged overcharge for the storage of a valise at Perryville, Maryland, and requested that the Railroad Company be required to file a schedule of its rates with the Commission covering the checking of parcels or baggage held by it at its various stations upon the request of patrons depositing such articles.

Counsel for the Railroad Company states that restitution has been made to Mr. Campbell for the overcharge in question, but suggests that the rates for the checking of parcels do not come within the juris-

diction conferred upon the Commission by the Maryland statute, and suggests further that inasmuch as the President of the United States has assumed control of all the railroads over the country pursuant to the Act of Congress of March 1, 1918, and was given power under such act to initiate and change the rates, fares and charges, etc., of railroad companies, any jurisdiction which this Commission might otherwise have had over the above charges of the Company has been suspended during said control of the railroads by the President of the United States.

The question of the pre-war jurisdiction of this Commission over charges made by railroad companies for the safekeeping of parcels checked at their stations was settled conclusively, so far as this Commission is concerned, by Opinion No. 123 of General Counsel Bruce filed September 27, 1912, in the matter of the complaint of George R. Harlow vs. Northern Central Railway Company (P. S. C. of Md. Report, Vol. 3, 1912, p. 463) and by the opinion and order of this Commission passed October 1, 1912, adopting the opinion of such General Counsel that this Commission had such jurisdiction (P. S. C. of Md. Report, Vol. 3, pp. 299-301).

The second point as to the Commission's jurisdiction raised by counsel for the Railroad Company would seem to be settled in favor of the Company's contention by Opinion No. 343 of General Counsel Bruce filed May 29, 1918, in which the General Counsel said, referring to General Order No. 28 bearing date May 25, 1918, issued by the Hon. William G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads, and his telegram bearing date May 26, 1918, to the Chairman of this Commission:

"Its effect, in my judgment, is to transfer to the President of the United States, acting through the Director General of Railroads, and to the Interstate Commerce Commission, all the jurisdiction and authority which you have heretofore exercised over the freight rates, passenger fares and baggage charges of railroad and steamship lines within the State of Maryland. The order is applicable alike to both interstate and intrastate class and commodity freight rates, and to both interstate and intrastate passenger fares (including commutation fares) and baggage charges; and by its terms it becomes effective June 25, 1918, as to freight rates, and June 10, 1918, as to passenger fares and baggage charges."

Under the above ruling of the General Counsel the Commission's powers in relation to railroad parcel-room rates are suspended until the efflux of the period of one year and nine months next following the date of the proclamation by the President of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace, that being the period fixed by the above Act of Congress for its own duration.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(358)

August 19, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Dear Sirs:

I am in receipt of a letter of your Secretary under date of August 12, 1918, requesting me, in the absence of General Counsel Bruce, for an opinion upon the point raised by a letter from O. L. Tunis to the Commission of prior date.

Mr. Tunis asks whether or not this Commission has jurisdiction over a ferry operated by the County Commissioners of Anne Arundel County from the road leading from Camp Parole to Taylorsville on the south side of South River.

This ferry evidently forms a part of the county road system of Anne Arundel County. The Public Service Commission Law confers no jurisdiction upon the Commission over a ferry of this kind or over the operation of the same by County Commissioners.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,
Assistant General Counsel.

(359)

August 19, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Dear Sirs:

I have before me a letter from Harry R. Hall, Acting Chief Engineer of the State Department of Health to Mr. Charles G. Edwards, Assistant Engineer of this Commission, in which the former asks whether or not the Pocomoke Bridge Company is authorized by law to furnish free transportation to employees of the State Department of Health when engaged in official business.

The Pocomoke City bridge crosses the Pocomoke River, which divides Somerset and Worcester Counties. By Chapter 272 of the Acts of 1916 this Commission was given jurisdiction over all such bridges.

The right of common carriers to give free passage or passage at reduced rates to various classes of persons was considered very exhaustively by Assistant General Counsel Albert C. Ritchie in his opinion under date of August 13, 1910, in the matter of the inquiry by The United Railways and Electric Company concerning its right to issue passes to certain classes of persons, under the provisions of the

Public Service Commission Law, P. S. C. of Md. Reports, Vol. 1, p. 78.

I feel that I cannot do better than quote what Mr. Ritchie said upon this precise point:

"Officials and employees connected with the State and City Governments. Section 16 of the Public Service Commission Law provides that the prohibition against free transportation shall not apply 'to the carriage free or at reduced rates, of persons or property for the United States, State or municipal governments.'

"Clearly this provision does not authorize the general free carriage of persons connected with the State or City Governments, but only authorizes the free carriage of such persons when they are attending to the State or City business. It is not the free carriage of individuals who happen to occupy State and City positions which the law permits, but the free carriage of such persons for the State or municipal government. This clearly means that persons answering this description can only be carried free while riding in connection with the public business. It is only then that they are traveling for the State or City, and in my opinion a person is not riding on the public business, within the meaning of the law, unless his business is of such a character that he could properly charge either the State or the city with his transportation expenses.

"It follows, in my judgment, that general passes or pass books should not be issued to State or municipal officials unless some method can be devised for confining their use to transportation connected with the public business."

I concur fully in the views so expressed.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(360)

August 19, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Dear Sirs:

I am in receipt of a letter of your Secretary under date of August 12, 1918, requesting my opinion in the absence of General Counsel Bruce upon certain questions raised by a letter from W. D. J. Morris, attorney for the Commissioners of St. Michael's, under date of August 9, 1918.

Mr. Morris enclosed with his letter a copy of Chapter 49 of the Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1918 authorizing the purchase by the Commissioners of St. Michael's of the electric lighting plant technically owned by Thomas E. Harrison and others, stating in his letter that said Commissioners had practically taken over the property already and had by ordinance or resolution assumed the outstanding obligations of said Harrison, et al., for money expended on said plant by executing the corporation's notes at six months within the \$25,000 authorized, these interim notes being issued to finance the project temporarily until the bond market might rise sufficiently to justify the sale of the 5 per cent. bonds named in the Act. Mr. Morris asks whether it is necessary to get permission from this Commission to issue the aforesaid notes for said short term of six months and whether the permission of this Commission is essential to the transfer of said property to said Commissioners of St. Michael's.

Chapter 445 of the Acts of 1914 provides that every municipal corporation of this State engaged in the business of manufacturing and supplying or of supplying gas or electricity for other than municipal purposes shall be included within the terms gas corporation and electrical corporation as defined in the Act and shall be subject as other gas and electrical corporations are to the provisions of the Act.

Section 32 as originally enacted provided that no municipality except the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore should build, maintain and operate for other than municipal purposes any works or systems for the manufacture and supply of gas or electricity for lighting purposes without a certificate of authority granted by the Commission.

This latter section also provides that no gas corporation or electrical corporation incorporated under the laws of this or any other State shall begin construction or exercise any right or privilege under any franchise hereafter granted or under any franchise heretofore granted but not heretofore actually exercised, without first having obtained the permission and approval of the Commission.

Section 34 provides that a gas or electrical corporation may issue stocks, bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness payable at periods of more than twelve months after the date thereof, when necessary for the acquisition of property, the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its plant or distributing system, or for the improvement or maintenance of its service, or for the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations, or (as amended by the Acts of 1918) to make its capitalization conform to a valuation of its property determined by the Commission. This section further provides that such gas or electrical corporation may issue notes, for proper corporate purposes, payable at periods of not more than twelve months without such consent, but no such notes shall, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, be refunded by any issue of stock or bonds or by any evidence of indebtedness running for more than twelve months without the consent of the Commission. All the above provisions of law are applicable to the Commissioners of St. Michael's with respect

to their purchase and operation of the electric lighting plant referred to in the letter of their attorney.

Technically it would not be necessary for the Commissioners of St. Michael's to secure the approval of this Commission of its proposed six months' notes, but inasmuch as the attorney for the Company states that while these notes are to be nominally for six months, their issue is for the purpose of financing the transfer until the bond market rises sufficiently to justify the sale of 5 per cent. bonds, a condition which may well require the renewal of such notes from time to time for periods in excess of one year in the aggregate, and inasmuch, further, as the issuing of these notes is so closely interwoven with other features of the transaction as to which the Commissioners must have the approval of the Commission, it seems to me that the case is one in which the Commissioners of St. Michael's should present all the facts to this Commission by appropriate petition, and secure the approval of this Commission as to all the phases of the proposed transaction in the one order.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(361)

August 20, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Dear Sirs:

I have before me a letter from W. M. Coulter to the Commission under date of August 9, 1918, in which he states that he has received a bill from the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company for the quarter beginning April 1, ending July 1, 1918, in which he is charged on the basis of the new rates established by the Commission's Order No. 4425 in Case No. 375, and asks whether the Company is entitled to charge these rates for said quarter or whether the new rates become effective from the time they were established by the Commission.

The Commission's Order No. 4425 of July 25, 1918, in case No. 375 establishing new schedules of rates declared the rates and charges for service prescribed and set forth in Schedule P. S. C. Md. No. 3 of the Baltimore County Water and Electric Company filed with the Commission November 20, 1917, to be unjust, unreasonable and unjustly discriminating "to the extent that they are in the case of any individual customer in excess of the rates and charges hereinafter prescribed."

Under the Public Service Commission Law the rates filed by the Company November 20, 1917, became effective April 1, 1918, without

any express approval on the part of this Commission. They therefore continued in effect until July 25, 1918, when, by the Commission's Order No. 4425, they were declared unreasonable to the extent above stated, but only to that extent.

Consequently it was proper for the Company to bill for the entire quarter beginning April 1, 1918, on the basis of the rates prescribed by Order No. 4425 above referred to.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) OSBORNE I. YELLOTT,

Assistant General Counsel.

(362)

Ruling on

The Status of THOMAS PETERS, JR.,
Whether or Not a "Water Company."

September 13, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 9th inst., in relation to the complaint of William J. Stull and others against Thomas Peters, Jr.

The complaint in this case alleges that Mr. Peters is a "water company" within the meaning of the Public Service Commission Law, and that he is not properly discharging his public obligations as such; and prays that he be required to maintain and furnish at all times a safe and adequate supply of water. Mr. Harper, the Rate Clerk of the Commission, reports that the facts of the case are these: About four years ago, Mr. Peters, being the owner of a considerable amount of ground at White Hall, in Baltimore County, on which he had erected a number of houses, in order to sell certain of these houses and to rent the remainder, decided to establish a central water plant for the accommodation of all the houses rather than to dig a well for the use of each of them; and this he did. There is nothing in the report of Mr. Harper to show that the plant has ever served any other houses than those mentioned above, or that Mr. Peters harbors any intention of serving others. On the contrary, having been drawn away from White Hall by a business employment, he wishes (so he tells Mr. Harper) to entirely discontinue the operation of the plant until he again takes up his residence at White Hall, and is willing (he also tells Mr. Harper) to lease the plant to the owners of the houses on the land free of rent, provided they will furnish the labor and material necessary for its operation at their own expense, and supply two of the houses which are owned by him with water free of cost to him.

In my opinion, so long as Mr. Peters does not enlarge the present scope of his water plant, it will be but a private accessory and convenience of the land development scheme which led to its erection, and therefore not amenable to the regulation or control of the Commission. The case in its facts solely resembles the Stuart Olivier case, in which I rendered a similar opinion, reported in Vol. 3, p. 465 of the printed reports of the Commission.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(363)

Question of
Discount on Water Bill.

} September 13, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 9th inst., which was accompanied by a letter, dated the 5th inst., in which Mr. Howard D. Gerhardt complains to you that he recently received a bill from the Baltimore County Water Company with a statement stamped on its face that the sum of 42 cents might be deducted if the bill were paid on or before September 1; that September 1 was a Sunday, and September 2 a legal holiday, and that he paid the bill on September 3, but that the Company declined to allow him the discount of 42 cents.

The Commission has no legal power to redress such a complaint as this. That is the business of a court of justice. The only thing that the Commission could lawfully do in the premises would be to pass an order forbidding, as a sound principle of administrative practice, the Water Company to stamp a statement on its bills holding out a discount in case of payment by its customers *on* or before a Sunday. It is but just to the Water Company to state that I am informed by its President, Mr. Wehr, that it was prepared to receive and give receipts for all payments of water rent on September 2, though the day was a legal holiday. Mr. Wehr also tells me that notwithstanding this fact, and the further fact that it seems to him that Mr. Gerhardt's own knowledge of the days of the week should have anticipated the misleading tendency of the statement, he will see that Mr. Gerhardt is paid the 42 cents if he will apply to him for a direction to that effect.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel,

(364)

Reference to
An Appeal from a Decision of the
Commission.

September 18, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have just received your communication of the 17th inst., enclosing me a notice of appeal filed with the Commission by W. Ashbie Hawkins, the attorney for the complainant in the matter of the complaint of Dr. William H. Wright as to the segregation of white and colored passengers on the W., B. & A. Electric Railway line. No such thing as an appeal in the ordinary sense from the action of the Commission is known to the Public Service Commission Law. If Mr. Hawkins wished to set aside the action of the Commission in this matter, he should have proceeded by filing a bill in chancery, pursuant to the provisions of Section 43 of the Public Service Commission Law.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(365)

Appropriations.

September 27, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

You asked me whether the legislative appropriations for the work of the Public Service Commission for the years 1919 and 1920 can be lawfully amended by shifting any amount appropriated to the use of the Commission from items appropriated for salaries or wages to items appropriated for expenses, or *vice versa*.

The request has been elicited by the suggestion that, under the provisions of Chapter 206 of the Acts of 1918, a sum may be shifted, pursuant to the course of amendment prescribed by that Act, from one amount appropriated for one item of expenses to another amount appropriated for another item of expenses, or from one amount appropriated for one item of salaries or wages to another amount appropriated for another item of salaries or wages; but that no such transfer can be operated by an amendment from any salary or wage item to any expense item, or from any expense item to any salary or wage item.

As I have said to the Commission orally, I can see no warrant for such a construction of Chapter 206 of the Acts of 1918. If it had been the intention of that Act to impose any such radical limitation upon the process of amendment provided for by its terms, it is certainly fair to assume that the Act would have manifested this intention in express and explicit terms. It has done nothing of the sort, so far as I can see. The leading thought of the Act, in my opinion, was that there would be no occasion for imposing any check of any kind upon the power of amending legislative appropriations, within the total amount appropriated for the use of a particular department or province of the State Government, provided the power was delegated to an official so exalted in rank and so amenable to public opinion and popular control as the Governor of the State of Maryland.

When Section 3 of the Act says that any branch of the State Administration may at any time submit in writing to the Governor an amended schedule for the distribution and apportionment of the appropriations made to it, or any unexpended balance thereof, different from the manner set forth in the "schedule" contained in the Act, it intends by the word "schedule," in my judgment, all the items making up the appropriations for any branch of the State Administration, whether items for salaries or wages, or items for expenses. It is true that in the Act the heading "schedule" precedes the items for salaries or wages of the Commission, and that the same heading precedes the items for the expenses of the Commission, and that this statement applies also to the other, though not absolutely to all the other, branches of the State Administration. But these headings, in my opinion, are mere sub-divisions of the one entire schedule of both the items for salaries or wages and for expenses appropriated to each branch of the State Administration. The distinction between schedule and schedule in the Act, in other words, is not to be taken between these headings in connection with the appropriations made to a particular branch of the State Administration by the Act, but between these headings considered as a unit in connection with a particular branch of the State Administration, and the same headings considered as units in connection with other branches of the State Administration. In one case in the Act, at any rate, as I have intimated, the word schedule appears but once in connection with the appropriations for a particular branch of the State Administration. I refer to the Secretary of State. The appropriations to the Secretary of State read simply:

For Salary.....	\$2,000
For Expenses.....	2,000
Schedule: Printing of Maryland Manual...	1,000, Etc.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(366)

Right of

UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COM-
PANY to Collect Increased Passenger
Rates Prior to Hearing by Commission.

October 2, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 30th ult., and also the letter from Charles S. Solomon, 405 West Redwood Street, to you, dated September 27, 1918, which accompanied it.

Mr. Solomon asks you, in effect, whether The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore has the legal right to collect increased rates from its passengers, pursuant to the tariff schedule recently filed by it with the Commission (effective October 1, 1918) before the Commission has decided that the increased rates are just and reasonable.

In my opinion, the Railways Company has the right to do so. The Commission has several times asked the Legislature to confer upon it the power, which has been conferred by Congress upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, of suspending a rate fixed by a public service corporation pending the final hearing of the controversy, but so far the Legislature has declined to confer such a power upon the Commission.

Truly yours,
W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(367)

Right of

Commission to Force UNITED RAILWAYS
AND ELECTRIC COMPANY to Issue Re-
ceipt Slips for Amount Paid in Excess
of 5 Cents Fare.

October 2, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 1st inst., together with the complaint filed by Mr. Peter Peck with you, under date of September 27, 1918.

The complaint asks the Commission to pass an order requiring The United Railways and Electric Company to issue excess fare receipts to passengers paying the increased rates fixed by its new tariff schedule which became effective on October 1, 1918.

In my opinion, the Commission has no power to pass such an order. As you are aware, the Legislature has several times declined to confer upon the Commission *pendente lite* the power to suspend a rate initiated by a common carrier. The Commission therefore lacks the authority to suspend rates pending a rate controversy before it, and consequently, for analogous reasons, lacks the authority, in my opinion, to annex any qualification to, or to impose any burden upon, such a rate when initiated before the final hearing in the case. It is true that it was provided by Section 768 of Article 4, of the Public Local Laws of Maryland relating to Baltimore City, that The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore should charge 5 cents and 3 cents respectively, and no more, for each passenger over 12 years of age and each child between the ages of 4 and 12 years respectively. But this law, in my opinion, was repealed by Section 31½ of the Public Service Commission Law, which declares as follows:

"All Acts or parts of Acts heretofore passed and now existing prescribing or limiting the price at which any gas corporation or electrical corporation or any other corporation subject to this Act may furnish, sell or dispose of its gas, or electricity, or other product or utility, are hereby repealed; it being the intent of this Act that the powers of the Commission herein created to ascertain the price of such gas or electricity or other product or utility, as provided for herein, shall supersede all such Acts or parts of Acts, aforesaid."

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(368)

In the Matter of

Excessive Whistle Blowing by the W., B.
& A. Railway Trains at the Foot of
Scott Street.

October 26, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 23rd inst., which was accompanied by a letter to you, dated the 20th inst., from Mr. Samuel Davidson, who complains of the excessive blowing of whistles by the W., B. & A. Railway at the incline at the foot of Scott Street. His sick wife, he says, has been seriously affected by this whistling; and he adds, that other persons who reside in the same locality have also been annoyed by the same cause.

In my opinion, Mr. Davidson cannot, on the plea of mere residence and proximity to the tracks of the Railway Company, apply to the Commission for relief from annoyance or nervous distress occasioned by the excessive whistling of locomotives, but if he is in the habit of using the passenger trains of the W., B. & A. Railway he would, in my judgment, have the necessary footing, as a passenger, to invoke the authority of the Commission for the redress of his grievance; just as he would have in the case of any other unreasonable practice of the Railway Company, which unduly interfered with his physical comfort or mental quietude.

Truly yours,
W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(369)

In the Matter of

Commutation Rates of the WASHINGTON
AND ROCKVILLE RAILWAY COMPANY.

November 7, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 6th inst., asking me whether the Washington and Rockville Railway Company can lawfully file commutation rates with the Commission repugnant to the special provisions of Chapter 220 of the Acts of 1910 and Chapter 424 of the Acts of 1912.

The Act of 1910 prescribed three 5-cent cash fare zones for the Railway Company, and required it to sell monthly commutation tickets and monthly commutation school tickets of certain descriptions at certain rates. The Act of 1912 repealed the Act of 1910 and re-enacted it with amendments so as to prescribe four 5-cent cash fare zones for the Railway Company, and to provide for monthly commutation tickets, monthly commutation school tickets, and family tickets of certain descriptions at certain rates. The main effect of the Act of 1912 was to add another class of tickets, namely "family tickets," to the reduced rate tickets required by the Act of 1910, and to reduce the rate of monthly commutation tickets from the rate fixed by the Act of 1910 (66⅔ per centum of the full 5-cent cash fare) to a rate not exceeding 42.5 per centum thereof; and the monthly commutation school tickets from the rate fixed by the Act of 1910 (50 per centum of the full 5-cent cash fare) to a rate not exceeding 42.5 per centum thereof.

In my opinion, both of these enactments are unconstitutional and void, so far as they attempt to prescribe fare zones and to fix rates for the Railway Company, because they violate the provisions of Section 33 of Article 3 of the Maryland State Constitution, which declare:

"And the General Assembly shall pass no special law for any case for which provision has been made by any existing general law."

--- In the Act of 1910 was approved on April 11, 1910, the Public Service Commission Law, which was approved on April 5, 1910, was printed on the statute book, and if the law did not clothe the Commission with the power to require a railway company to issue monthly commutation tickets, monthly commutation school tickets and family tickets, in addition to full cash fare tickets against its will, it at least clothed the Commission with the power to regulate the reduced charges on tickets when voluntarily issued by a railway company.

Penna. R. R. Co., lessee of N. C. Ry. Co., vs. Towers et al.,
constituting the Public Service Commission of Md., 245
U. S., 6 confirming 126 Md., 59.

Whether the Commission can voluntarily, upon the issuance of common or quasi commutation tickets at reduced rates by a common carrier should the carrier will it or no, is a question that is left undecided by the controversy in these cases. Personally, I think, and I always thought, that, under the broad powers over rates and with which it is endowed by the Public Service Commission Law, provided that in fixing reduced rates for different classes of commutation and quasi commutation tickets it does not incur the odium of arbitrary and unreasonable classification condemned by the

law of the land and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. But, to say the least, it must be held, in my judgment, in the light of the decisions in the Pennsylvania Railroad case, to which I have just referred, that the policy of the General Assembly in the enactment of the Public Service Commission Law, considered independently of any subsequent amendments thereto, was, as respects all railroad and railway corporations within the State of Maryland (whether the Washington and Rockville Railway Company or any other railroad or railway company), to leave the common carrier free to issue commutation or quasi commutation tickets at reduced rates at its pleasure, but to fully subject all such tickets, as to their privileges, limitations and prices to the jurisdiction and regulation of the Commission when once issued. By the proviso annexed to Section 16 of the Public Service Commission Law, it is, out of abundant caution, affirmed that nothing in that law shall prevent the issuance of mileage, excursion, school commutation, commutation passenger tickets, or half-fare tickets for the transportation of children under 12 years of age, or joint interchangeable mileage tickets with special privilege as to the amount of free baggage that may be carried on the mileage tickets of 100 miles or more. "But," the same proviso still more studiously affirms:

"Before any common carrier, subject to the provisions of this Act, shall issue any such mileage, excursion, school commutation, commutation passenger ticket, half-fare tickets, or joint interchangeable mileage ticket, with special privileges as aforesaid, it shall file with the Commission copies of the tariffs of rates, fares or charges on which such tickets are to be based, together with the specifications of the amount of free baggage permitted to be carried under such joint interchangeable mileage ticket, in the same manner as common carriers are required to do with regard to other rates by this Act."

So it seems to me immaterial to inquire whether the Public Service Commission Law, in its original form, endowed the Commission with authority to compel a railroad or railway company to issue commutation or quasi commutation tickets at reduced rates, or merely evidenced a legislative policy as wide as the entire limits of the State of Maryland and applicable to all railroads and railways within these limits, that Maryland railroad and railway companies should be allowed to issue commutation and quasi commutation tickets as they chose, or did not chose, but, nevertheless, be all the same under the obligation to file with the Commission copies of the rate tariffs on which such tickets were based, if actually issued, and be subject to plenary authority on the part of the Commission to regulate their nature and terms; in either view of the case the Public Service Commission Law must be deemed a general law.

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side.]

(370)

Right of

The CUMBERLAND AND WESTERNPORT
ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY to File
Tariff Rates.

November 22, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 20th inst., asking me whether the Cumberland and Westernport Electric Railway Company has the legal power to file tariff schedules with the Commission fixing rates in excess of those prescribed by the franchise agreement entered into between itself, or some of its corporate predecessors, and the County Commissioners of Allegany County; all of these agreements having been executed prior to the approval of the Public Service Commission Law on April 5, 1910.

In my judgment, the Cumberland and Westernport Electric Railway Company has the legal power to do so. Contracts even as between individuals when entered into are necessarily subject to the control of the police power of the State whenever a contract relates to matters which are, or may be, subject to the exercise of such powers.

Yeatman vs. Public Service Commission, 126 Md., 513, 518.

Manigault vs. Spring, 199 U. S., 473.

L. & N. Ry. Co. vs. Mottley, 219 U. S., 467.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(371)

Reference to

Reduced Rate for Gas Consumption for
the PARK SCHOOL.

December 10, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 29th ult., in which you ask me, in effect, whether the Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company would have the power to allow a reduced gas rate to the Park School.

There is no provision anywhere in the Public Service Commission Law for the issuance of a free pass, or for the allowance of a reduced rate, fare, or charge by a public service corporation to one of its patrons or customers which happens to be an educational institution.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(372)

Grade Crossing Over the Line of the CITY AND SUBURBAN RAILWAY OF WASHINGTON.	}	December 10, 1918.
--	---	--------------------

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I reply to your communication of the 6th inst., which was accompanied by a letter, dated the 5th inst., from Mr. Thomas Benedict Calvert to you, in which he seeks the approval by the Commission of a grade crossing over the tracks of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington rendered necessary by the proposed construction of a public State highway through the town of Mt. Rainier to a point on the Washington and Baltimore Boulevard. The City and Suburban Railway of Washington is willing to grant the right-of-way for the road over its tracks, only in case the Commission approves the grade crossing.

By the provisions of Section 23 of the Public Service Commission Law, the Commission is given power to order *changes in the tracks* of any railroad, or street railroad corporation to promote the security or convenience of the public or employees, or to secure adequate service or facilities for the transportation of passengers, freight or property; but there must be a hearing, of which full notice should be given to the public, so that anyone wishing to urge objections to the proposition may have the opportunity to urge them. My advice to the Commission is to take cognizance of the matter.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

(373)

WASHINGTON AND ROCKVILLE RAILWAY
COMPANY. Question of Injunction
Proceedings.

December 10, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your letter of the 9th inst., in which you ask me whether the Commission "may by injunction or otherwise prevent the rates of the Washington and Rockville Railway Company going into effect on full 30 days' statutory notice."

I answer that I know of no preventive recourse of any sort to which the Commission can resort under the circumstances. I assume, of course, that it would be impossible for the Commission to fix and hold a final hearing and pass a final order before the efflux of the 30 days. Unlike the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Public Service Commission of Maryland has no power to suspend a rate filed with it before hearing; and this deficiency of power on the part of the Commission the General Assembly of Maryland has several times recently refused to supply.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,

General Counsel.

(374)

Authority of

The Commission to Fix Fare Zones Inside
of the New Limits of Baltimore City.

December 28, 1918.

*Public Service Commission,
Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.*

Gentlemen:

I have received your communication of the 20th inst., in which you ask me for my opinion as to whether the effect of Section 2 of Chapter 82 of the Acts of 1918 (commonly known as the Baltimore City Annexation Act of 1918) was, when read in connection with Chapter 318 of the Acts of 1900 relating to street railway fares in Baltimore City, to declare that The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore should charge five cents, and no more, as a fare for the conveyance of each passenger over 12 years of age, and three cents, and no more, for each child between the ages of 4 and 12 years from any point on any of its lines to any other point on such lines within the City of Baltimore as enlarged by the Annexation Act.

In my opinion, no such effect is to be ascribed to Section 2 of this Act, when considered in its relations to the Act of 1900; and for the reason that when the Annexation Act became a law the railway fares prescribed by the Act of 1900, together with the provisions in regard to free transfers associated therewith in the latter Act and the single fare-zone created by the Act (which were merely incidental and dependent features of the rates themselves) had been repealed by Section 31½ of the Public Service Commission Law (Chapter 180 of the Acts of 1910, approved April 5, 1910) which provides as follows:

"All Acts or parts of Acts heretofore passed and now existing prescribing or limiting the price at which any gas corporation, or electrical corporation, or any other corporation subject to this Act may furnish, sell or dispose of its gas or electricity or other product or utility are hereby repealed; it being the intent of this Act that the powers of the Commission herein created to ascertain the price of such gas or electricity or other product or utility, as provided for herein, shall supersede all such Acts or parts of Acts aforesaid."

These provisions of the Public Service Commission Law came under the review of the Court of Appeals in the case of Gregg vs. Laird, 121 Md., 1, and it was there held that the provisions of the Maryland General Code, in force at the time of the passage of the Public Service Commission Law, which fixed a maximum rate for the grounded telephone service, and defined the elements of which the grounded telephone apparatus was to consist, were repealed by them. In my judgment, the language of Section 31½ of the Public Service Commission Law is as clearly applicable to the street railway fares prescribed and the single fare-zone created by Chapter 313 of the Acts of 1900 as to the telephone rate and telephone equipment involved in that case.

If this is a correct conclusion, it follows that when the Annexation Act became a law Chapter 313 of the Acts of 1900 was non-existent. And if that also be true, it surely cannot be argued that the intent of Section 2 of the Annexation Act in providing that all local laws applicable to Baltimore City shall be applicable to such portions of Baltimore and Anne Arundel Counties as shall be annexed to Baltimore City under the Act was to revive it. It is manifest that this language has in contemplation only such local laws as were still in force.

As I see it, therefore, it is entirely competent for the Commission to prescribe for The United Railways and Electric Company more than one fare zone within the limits of Baltimore City as extended by the Annexation Act.

Truly yours,

W. CABELL BRUCE,
General Counsel.

APPENDIX IV

Summary for Twelve Months Ended
September 30, 1918

METER TESTS

Gas, Electric, Water and Steam

GAS TESTS AND ANALYSES

ACCIDENTS

Personal Accident Reports

TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITY COMPANIES

3	Hagerstown Light & Heat Company.....	42	2	6	226	43	94	268	45	100	413	
5	"	81	3	16	109	38	50	190	41	66	297	
10	"	6	1	3	6	1	3	10	
20	"	2	4	2	4	6	
30	"	1	3	1	3	4	
100	"	1	2	3	3	
733														
3	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Company.....	154	14	33	54	14	33	201	
5	"	50	9	6	50	9	6	65	
10	"	4	1	1	4	1	1	6	
20	"	1	1	1	
45	"	1	1	1	
200	"	1	1	1	
275														
3	Havre de Grace Gas Company.....	64	3	10	12	2	76	3	12	91	
5	"	7	2	7	2	9	
100														
5	Hyattsville Gas & Electric Company.....	90	3	22	50	16	42	146	19	64	239	
60	"	1	1	1	
230														
3	Milburn, Alexander, Company, Baltimore.....	1	1	1	
1														
5	West Virginia & Maryland Gas Company.....	44	16	20	44	16	20	80	
10	"	552	111	247	552	111	247	910	
20	"	2	2	2	
30	"	1	1	1	
40	"	1	1	1	
60	"	3	4	1	3	4	1	8	
1,002														
Totals.....		4,489	254	893	13,261	1,208	3,362	3	4	17,750	1,465	4,259	23,474
23,474														

Total new gas meters tested..... 5,636
Total old gas meters tested..... 17,831
Total complaint gas meters tested..... 7
Grand Total, gas meters..... 23,474

SUMMARY OF ELECTRIC METER TESTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Size Amps.	Company	New	Old	Complaint			Totals	Com- pany Totals
				O. K.	Fast	Slow		
5	Algonquin Building Company, Baltimore.....		1				1	1
5	Annapolis Public Utilities Company.....	149	9				158	
10	"	30					30	
20	"	3					3	
25	"	13					13	
75	"	1					1	
250	"	1					1	
400	"	1					1	207
5	Antietam Electric Light & Power Company..		3				3	
10	"		1				1	
15	"		1				1	
50	"		1				1	
75	"		1				1	
10	Bel Air Electric Company.....	5					5	
200	Brueckman Electric Company, Baltimore....		2				2	5
10	Calvert Bldg. & Construction Co., Baltimore.	1					1	
15	"	1					1	
50	"	1					1	
75	"	1					1	
150	"	1					1	
5	Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.....		10				10	11
25	"	1					1	
3	Cons. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....		77				77	
5	"	3,904	1,552		4		5,460	
7	"	2					2	
10	"	178	559		2		739	
15	"	70	224				294	7,318
20	"	1	18		1		20	
25	"	46	186				232	
30	"		3				3	
40	"		3				3	
50	"	51	170				221	
60	"	4	13				17	
75	"	35	37				72	
80	"	2	1				3	
100	"	14	35				49	
120	"		1				1	
150	"	10	17				27	
200	"	17	12				29	
300	"	12	11				23	
400	"	4	3				7	
450	"		1				1	
500	"	1					1	
600	"	8	5				13	
800	"	4	16				20	
1000	"	4					4	
5	Cons. Public Utilities Co., Westminster.....	10	1				11	27
10	"	6					6	
25	"	4					4	
50	"	2					2	
75	"	3					3	
150	"	1					1	
5	Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company.....	24					24	33
10	"	9					9	
5	Eastern Shore Gas & Electric Company.....	215	28				243	
10	"	3					3	252
25	"	6					6	
5	Hagerstown Municipal Electric Plant.....	237					237	
10	"	6					6	
15	"	18					18	
25	"	6					6	
50	"	5					5	
	Forward.....	5,131	3,002		7		8,140	8,140

SUMMARY OF ELECTRIC METER TESTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1918

—Concluded.

Size Amps.	Company	New	Old	Complaint			Totals	Com- pany Totals
				O. K.	Fast	Slow		
	Forward.....	5,131	3,002	7	8,140	8,140
5	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Company..	445	106	551	722
10	"	5	4	9	
15	"	19	3	22	
20	"	2	2	
25	"	62	9	71	
50	"	34	6	40	
75	"	1	1	
100	"	19	19	
150	"	6	6	
600	"	1	1	
5	Harpers Ferry Electric Light & Power Co....	44	7	51	58
10	"	1	1	
15	"	2	2	4	
25	"	1	1	
50	"	1	1	
3	Havre de Grace Electric Company.....	1	1	107
5	"	96	5	101	
10	"	1	1	
20	"	2	2	
25	"	1	1	
50	"	1	1	32
5	Home Mfg. Light & Power Company, Elkton..	16	14	30	
10	"	1	1	
25	"	1	1	1
25	National Electric Company, Hamilton.....	1	1	
5	Pocomoke Electric & Ice Manufacturing Co..	179	179	
10	"	49	49	247
15	"	19	19	
100	Standard Elevator & Electric Co., Baltimore..	1	1	
200	Tottle, W. A. & Co., Baltimore.....	1	1	1
5	Trappe Electric Light Company.....	22	22	22
	Totals.....	6,158	3,166	7	9,331	9,331

Total new meters tested.....6,158

Total old meters tested.....3,166

Total complaint meters tested.....7

Grand total, electric meters.....9,331

GRAND SUMMARY OF METER TESTS.

Company	Gas	Electric	Totals
Algonquin Building Co., Baltimore.....	1	1
Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....	157	207	364
Antietam Electric Light & Power Co.....	7	7
Bel Air Electric Co.....	5	5
Brueckman Electric Co.....	2	2
Calvert Building & Construction Co.....	5	5
Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.....	11	11
Citizens Gas Co., Salisbury.....	23	23
Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Baltimore.....	20,435	7,318	27,753
Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....	284	27	311
Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Co.....	33	33
Crisfield Light & Power Co.....	39	39
Eastern Shore Gas & Electric Co.....	163	252	415
Easton Light & Fuel Co.....	24	24
Elkton Gas Co.....	8	8
Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.....	733	733
Hagerstown Municipal Electric Plant.....	272	272
Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	275	722	997
Harpers Ferry Electric Light & Power Co., W. Va.....	58	58
Havre de Grace Electric Co.....	107	107
Havre de Grace Gas Co.....	100	100
Home Manufacturing Light & Power Co.....	32	32
Hyattsville Gas & Electric Co.....	230	230
Milburn, Alexander, Co., Baltimore.....	1	1
National Electric Co., Hamilton.....	1	1
Pocomoke Electric & Ice Manufacturing Company.....	247	247
Standard Elevator & Electric Co.....	1	1
Tottle, W. A., & Co., Baltimore.....	1	1
Trappe Electric Light Co.....	22	22
West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co.....	1,002	1,002
Totals.....	23,474	9,331	32,805

Total gas meters.....	23,474
Total electric meters.....	9,331
Grand total.....	32,805

SUMMARY OF TESTS OF COMPLAINT METERS

	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918
GAS METERS:								
Total number tested.....	24	56	26	21	23	18	12	7
Total over 2% fast.....	1	8	1	4	3	2	6	1
ELECTRIC METERS:								
Total number tested.....	23	30	10	4	7	12	9	7
Total over 4% fast.....	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
WATER METERS:								
Total number tested.....	2	3	18	13	20	16	13	10
Total over 4% fast.....	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
STEAM METERS:								
Total number tested.....	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5
Total over 4% fast.....	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

COMPLAINT GAS METER TESTS

CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE

Date Test	Card No.	Size Lt.	Applicant	RESULTS			Paid by
				O. K.	% Fast	% Slow	
10-9-17	197	5	Rev. Wm. F. Roberts.....	1.0	App.
11-30-17	198	5	J. V. Buckler.....	0.5	
1-31-18	199	5	Dr. W. Winsey.....	1.0	"
3- 5-18	200	5	Wm. I. Radecky.....	2.4	"
3- 9-18	201	5	Dr. H. Ross Coppage.....	3.1	Oper. Co. App.
3-13-18	202	5	Daniel Gough.....	1.5	
9- 3-18	203	80	C. F. Meislahn & Co.....	1.0	
Totals.....				0	3	4	

Total number tested..... 7

Total over 2% fast..... 1

COMPLAINT ELECTRIC METER TESTS

CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE

Date Test	Card No.	Size Amps.	Applicant	RESULTS			Paid by
				O. K.	% Fast	% Slow	
12- 6-17	99	5	J. H. Rosenblatt.....	0.30	App.
12- 6-17	100	5	J. H. Rosenblatt.....	0.90	
1- 1-18	101	20	Percy H. Goodwin.....	5.60	Oper. Co. App.
5- 2-18	102	10	H. Carroll Brown.....	1.80	
4-22-18	103	5	S. E. Phillips.....	2.70	"
5-23-18	104	5	A. J. Rice.....27	
7-23-18	105	10	The Zimmerman Ice Co., Inc.....75	
Totals.....				0	7	0	

Total number tested..... 7

Total over 4% fast..... 1

COMPLAINT WATER METER TESTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1918

Date Test	Card No.	Size Inch	Applicant and Company	RESULTS			Paid by
				O. K.	% Fast	% Slow	
10- 9-17	94	1	Charles W. Slagle, Roland Park Water Co.....			1.4	App.
12- 5-17	95	¾	George S. Wigfall, Denmore Park Hotel Water, Light & Heating Co.....		1.2		"
2- 3-18	96	¾	Dr. J. T. Geraghty, Roland Park Water Co.....		0.6		"
3-18-18	97	1	Er.....			0.033	"
4-19-18	98	¾	B..... r Co.....			0.07	"
5- 3-18	99	¾	Ir..... tel Water, ng Co.....			6.4	"
7- 1-18	100	¾	H..... Artesian Water Co.....			1.03	"
7-29-18	101	¾	Garrison Building Co., Artesian Water Co.....			1.63	"
8-20-18	102	¾	C. F. Harper, Baltimore County Water and Electric Co.....		0.2		"
9- 3-18	104	¾	Mrs. Raymond Milburn, Baltimore County Water and Electric Co.....			0.75	"
Totals.....				0	4	6	

Total number tested.....10

Total over 4% fast..... 0

COMPLAINT STEAM METER TESTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Date Test	Card No.	Size No.	Complainant and Company	RESULTS			Paid by
				O. K.	% Fast	% Slow	
12-18-17	3	2	M. S. DeHuff				
			John J. Carlin Heating Co.....	1.13	App.
2-15-18	4	3	Mrs. Rush Smith				
			John J. Carlin Heating Co.....	2.2	"
2-25-18	5	3	Siegel, Rothschild & Co.,				
			Terminal Freezing & Heating Co....		2.91	"
2-25-18	6	2	A. Roth Shoe Manufacturing Co.,				
			Terminal Freezing & Heating Co....		6.54	"
6- 4-18	7	1	Mrs. Caldwell Woodruff,				
			John J. Carlin Heating Co.....	6.4	Oper. Co.
Totals.....				0	3	2	

Total number tested 5
Total over 4% fast..... 1

SUMMARY OF GAS TESTS AND ANALYSES.

CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY OF BALTIMORE.

DATE	CANDLE POWER			B. T. U. TOTAL HEATING VALUE		
	High	Low	Ave.	High	Low	Ave.
October, 1917.....	19.4	17.1	18.4	617	585	601
November, 1917.....	19.1	20.1	17.0	612	577	598
December, 1917.....	19.7	14.5	17.9	598	553	580
January, 1918.....	20.5	10.3	17.2	588	507	564
February, 1918.....	17.6	14.8	16.5	573	536	555
March, 1918.....	17.6	12.5	15.7	581	518	552
April, 1918.....	16.1	13.3	14.8	567	544	555
May, 1918.....	21.8	12.7	15.2	603	531	559
June, 1918.....	16.0	13.1	14.4	572	550	558
July, 1918.....	16.0	12.2	14.1	573	543	555
August, 1918.....	17.1	12.4	15.0	568	530	554
September, 1918.....	19.9	14.5	16.4	587	551	562
RANGE IN AVERAGE						
Candle Power			Heating Value			
Maximum.....	18.4			601		
Minimum.....	14.1			552		

INTERRUPTIONS TO POWER SUPPLY—ELECTRIC RAILWAYS. SUMMARY OF REPORTS UNDER COMMISSION'S ORDER
No. 792.

Company	TIME OFF IN HOURS AND MINUTES												Total Time Off	Average per Month		
	Oct. 1917	Nov.	Dec.	Jan. 1918	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.				
	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m.	h. m. s.		
Capital Traction Co., Washington, D. C.....									0.45		0.18	0.04	1.07	0.05.35		
Cumberland Electric Railway Co., Cumberland, Md.....		0.30	1.37	1.20	2.20			3.55		1.15	1.05		12.02	1.00.10		
United Railways & Electric Co., Baltimore, Md.....	2.40	1.10	5.09	3.53	6.39	5.14	1.53	5.26	3.08	4.44	6.47	1.54	48.37	4.03.05		
Maryland Electric Railways Co., Annapolis, Md.....	1.04		0.37		8.49	0.03		1.48	2.50	0.36	2.24	1.37	19.48	1.39.00		
Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co., Frederick, Md.....	0.56	0.30	2.56	6.04		4.43	16.30		0.40	3.51	13.19	7.25	56.54	4.44.30		
Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway Co., Baltimore, Md.	1.58	1.31	5.59	4.03	0.55	1.25		8.43	4.08	4.43	6.06	16.29	56.00	4.40.00		
Washington Railway & Electric Co., Washington, D. C.....		0.47	1.29	2.00	0.50		0.36	1.00		2.55	11.45	0.41	22.03	1.50.15		
Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co., Cumberland, Md.....		2.00	1.38	1.10	3.25			4.00	1.45		0.50	0.20	15.08	1.15.40		
Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co., Belair, Md.....					0.30								00.30	0.02.30		
Chambersburg, Greencastle & Waynes- boro Street Railway Co. (Blue Ridge Ry.), Waynesboro, Pa.....	No in	terrupti	ons.													
Washington & Great Falls Railway & Power Co., Washington, D. C.....		0.20											00.20	0.01.40		
Baltimore & Belair Electric Railway, Belair, Md.....	No in	terrupti	ons.													
Kennington Railway Co., Kennington, Md.....	No in	terrupti	ons.													
Totals.....	6.38	6.48	19.25	18.30	23.28	11.25	18.59	24.52	13.16	18.04	42.34	28.30	232.29	19.22.25		

**SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF ALL TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.**

Class of Person	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.		Pennsylvania Railroad Co.		Western Maryland Railway Co.		Minor Steam Railroad Cos.		Total	
	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured
Public:										
On right of way.....	18	15	13	11	4	3	1	36	29
Passengers.....	8	60	13	37	2	1	16	100
Carried under contract.....	3	4	7
Others not trespassing.....	6	23	25	16	13	3	8	33	60
Total public.....	26	98	51	67	4	22	4	9	85	196
.....										
.....	16	215	5	106	1	113	2	21	34	456
.....	1	33	1	14	1	14	9	3	70
.....	1	162	2	36	2	60	1	6	6	254
.....	3	6	1	4	1	4	11
.....	8	8	5	9	2	4	3	13	21
Total employees.....	29	414	14	169	6	192	6	36	55	811
Grand total.....	55	512	65	236	10	214	10	45	140	1007

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE MINOR GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANIES IN MARYLAND.
OCTOBER 1, 1917—SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person.	October, 1917.		November.		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Totals.	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
PUBLIC:																										
Street or stations.
Consumers' premises.
Other places.
Total public.
EMPLOYEES:																										
Construction.
Operation.
Consumers' premises.
Other places.
Total employees.
Grand total.

Details of Above Table:
November, 1917 Havre de Grace Gas Co., 2 employees injured in gas explosion.
May, 1918. Gilpins Falls Electric Co., plant struck by lightning, killing man.
August, 1918. Potomac Electric Power Co., Mayor of Gaithersburg, Md., electrocuted turning off street lights; (as per agreement).

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF ALL UTILITY COMPANIES IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
OCTOBER 1, 1917--SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person	Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.		United Railways and Electric Co.		All Other Electric Railways		Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Co.		All Other Gas and Electric Companies		Totals	
	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured
Public:												
On street or Stations.....	1	23	26	694	13	12	1	41	729
Consumer's Premises or Com-pany's Territory.....	9	14	4,122	1	51	1	16	4,182
Vehicles and other places.....	4	10	413	5	20	15	437
Total public.....	1	36	50	5,229	19	83	2	72	5,348
Employees:												
Cars or construction.....	2	125	1	891	13	10	3	1,039
Track or operation.....	1	46	133	2	82	2	3	263
Consumer's Premises or Com-pany's Territory.....	58	288	5	351
Others.....	75	1	151	1	9	1	236
Total employees.....	3	304	2	1,463	14	2	106	2	7	1,889
Grand total	4	340	52	6,692	19	97	2	106	2	2	79	7,237

TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES.

PERSONS KILLED.

OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Company	Public	Employees	Total
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	26	29	55
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	51	14	65
Western Maryland Railway Co.	4	6	10
Minor steam railroad companies in Maryland.....	4	6	10
Totals.....	85	55	140

TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES.

PERSONS INJURED.

OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Company	Public	Employees	Total
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	98	414	512
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	67	169	236
Western Maryland Railway Co.....	22	192	214
Minor steam railroad companies in Maryland.....	9	36	45
Totals.....	196	811	1,007

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY.
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person	October, 1917.		November.		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Total	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
Public:																										
On right of way...	5	1																								
Passengers.....		1																								
Carried under con- tract.....																										
Others not trespass- ing.....																										
Total public....	5	2	2	4		1	1	1	2	4	1	16	3	2	4	4	1	10	4	48			3	6	26	98
Employees:																										
Trainmen.....	3	24	1	18		18	1	27	3	19		17	1	21	1	18	2	14	1	9	1	13	2	17	16	215
Trainmen in yards	1	3		1		3		1		6		3				5		4		2		4		1	1	33
Yard trainmen....		10		25		24		10		16		16	1	12		10		4		5		9		11	1	152
Trackmen and bridgemen.....								1	2	2		1									1		1	1	3	6
Other employees...				1		1	1		1			2		1			2	1	1	1				1	8	8
Employees not on duty.....																										
Total employees	4	37	1	45		46	2	39	6	43	1	39	2	34	1	33	4	23	2	17	3	27	3	31	29	414
Grand total.....	9	39	3	49		47	3	40	8	47	2	55	5	36	5	37	5	33	6	65	3	27	6	37	55	512

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY,
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person	October, 1917.		November.		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Total.	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
Public:																										
On right of way...	...	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	...	4	1	3	3	1	...	1	13	11
Passengers.....	...	1	1	...	2	1	2	4	1	5	2	5	1	...	13	37
Carried under con- tract.....	1	3
Others not trespass- ing.....	6	1	5	4	6	1	1	1	...	11	...	2	1	25	16
Total public....	6	2	7	7	1	3	1	2	2	9	2	9	8	11	3	7	9	9	16	6	3	2	51	67
Employees:																										
On right of way...	1	12	...	5	...	14	2	12	1	7	1	9	...	7	...	8	...	6	10	...	6	5	106
Passengers.....	...	3	...	1	1	4	...	4	1	...	1	4	1	...	4	1	14
Carried under con- tract.....	...	3	...	1	...	2	1	3	...	3	...	2	...	2	...	3	...	7	...	2	2	36
Others not trespass- ing.....	...	2	1	...	1	...	2	1	1	1	4
Total employees	1	20	9
Grand total.....	7	22	1	6	8	25	4	23	3	15	3	21	2	23	9	23	6	20	2	21	16	24	4	14	66	236

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY, OCTOBER 1, 1917—SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person.	October, 1917.		November.		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Totals.	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
PUBLIC:																										
Street or stations.	...	11	3	1	2	...	1	1	...	1	23
Subscribers' premises	...	6	2	1	9
Other places.	...	1	2	1	4
Total public.	...	18	...	2	3	3	...	2	2	4	3	1	1	36
EMPLOYEES:																										
Construction.	...	18	...	12	...	8	10	...	11	...	11	...	1	6	...	13	11	3	12	10	2	125
Subscribers' premises	...	1	...	4	...	2	4	...	3	8	1	4	2	9	4	5	1	46
Exchanges	...	3	...	9	...	8	2	...	4	...	7	...	3	4	5	2	3	8	...	58
On street.	4	...	7	7	...	12	...	4	...	17	2	2	...	13	...	5	...	2	75
Total Employees.	...	22	...	29	...	25	23	23	30	...	22	...	1	24	1	23	20	...	27	27	1	24	...	25	3	304
Grand totals.	...	40	...	31	...	25	26	...	32	...	24	...	1	38	1	23	23	...	28	...	1	24	1	26	4	840

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE UNITED RAILWAYS & ELECTRIC COMPANY OF BALTIMORE,
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person.	October, 1917.		November.		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Total.	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
Public:																										
Struck by cars.....	3	52	1	49	2	50	1	50	5	58	1	51	2	66	60	4	70	109	71	3	62	2	55	26	694	
Boarding cars.....	...	122	...	114	...	112	...	98	...	110	...	120	...	100	84	...	95	...	1	...	123	1	116	3	1,303	
Alighting from cars	1	111	1	101	1	80	...	53	...	44	...	94	...	68	80	1	112	1	126	1	122	7	1,109	
Leaving front plat-																										
form.....	...	52	...	55	...	43	...	32	...	28	...	31	1	37	47	...	44	...	39	...	39	...	51	1	498	
Falling from cars..	...	16	...	11	...	11	...	6	...	8	...	6	...	8	9	...	9	...	10	...	17	...	17	1	128	
On cars.....	...	74	...	52	...	63	...	73	1	52	...	41	...	59	63	...	61	...	68	...	76	...	86	1	768	
Collisions.....	...	25	...	14	...	21	...	22	...	24	...	14	...	29	21	...	36	...	37	...	43	...	30	1	316	
In vehicles.....	2	34	...	36	4	35	1	23	...	32	1	30	...	31	34	...	33	...	2	49	41	...	35	10	413	
Other persons	
Total public.....	6	486	2	432	7	415	4	357	6	356	2	387	3	398	4	398	5	460	4	501	3	527	4	512	50	5,229
Employees:																										
On cars.....	...	54	...	59	...	62	...	78	...	63	...	50	...	64	69	1	71	...	76	...	124	...	121	1	891	
On track.....	...	10	...	17	...	7	...	14	...	18	...	13	...	11	9	...	12	...	7	...	7	...	8	...	133	
In shops and barns	...	22	...	28	...	33	...	29	...	28	...	21	...	15	17	...	26	...	23	...	30	...	18	...	288	
Other employees..	1	17	...	13	...	16	...	20	...	10	...	19	...	2	16	...	8	...	12	...	8	...	10	1	151	
Total employees.	1	103	...	115	...	118	...	141	...	119	...	103	...	92	111	1	117	...	118	...	169	...	157	2	1,463	
Grand total.....	7	589	2	547	7	533	4	498	6	475	2	490	3	490	4	509	6	577	4	619	3	696	4	669	52	6,692

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE MINOR STEAM RAILROAD COMPANIES IN MARYLAND,
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person	October, 1917.		November.		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Total.	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
Public:																										
On right of way.....																										
Passengers.....																										
Carried under contract.....																										
Others not trespassing.....																										
Total public.....																										
Employees:																										
Trainmen.....		2						5		1																
Trainmen in yards				2			2		1																	
Yard trainmen.....	1						1																			
Trackmen and bridgemen.....																										
Other employees..									1																	
Employees not on duty.....																										
Total employees	1	2		2		4	8		1	2	2	5	1	4			1		2						6	36
Grand total.....	1	2		2		4	8		1	2	2	5	1	5	2	4	5		1	6	4	4	1	10		45

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE MINOR ELECTRIC RAILWAYS COMPANIES IN MARYLAND.
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Class of Person	October, 1917.		November		December.		January, 1918.		February.		March.		April.		May.		June.		July.		August.		September.		Total	
	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.	Killed.	Injured.
Public:	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	12
Pedestrians.....	...	22	3	1	51
Passengers.....	2	1	5	20
In vehicles.....	2
Total public....	2	25	2	5	9	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	5	5	5	1	4	4	9	2	13	19	83
Employees:	...	2	1	...	3	1	1	2	13
On cars.....
On track.....
In shops and barns
Others.....
Total employees.	...	2	1	...	3	1	1	2	14
Grand total.....	2	27	2	5	10	2	7	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	1	6	6	6	1	4	4	11	2	13	19	97

**SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ACCIDENT REPORTS OF THE PUBLIC MOTOR VEHICLES OPERATING IN MARYLAND,
OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.**

Cause	Public						Employees					
	Passengers		Pedestrians		Other Persons		Total Public		Operators		Other Employees	
	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Total Employees	Grand Total
.....	2	21	2	21	2
.....	3	3
.....	12	12
.....	2	2
.....	14	14
.....	19	7	1	26	26
.....	4	8	8
Totals.....	49	2	21	1	7	8	77	4	4	8	85

GRADE CROSSING ACCIDENTS, OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918.

Date	Company	Public or Private Crossing and Protection	Location	Pedestrians In Vehicles				Remarks
				Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	
Oct. 12, 1917	Hag. & Fredk. Ry. Co.	Public	Washington St., Hagerstown				7	Electric car collided with passenger train.
Oct. 13, 1917	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Severn			2		Auto struck by passenger train.
Oct. 15, 1917	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Private; no protection	Woodall St., Baltimore	1				Struck by freight train.
Oct. 18, 1917	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Severn			3		Auto struck by passenger train.
Oct. 21, 1917	West Md. Ry. Co.	Public; bell	Hampstead				5	Auto struck by passenger train.
Oct. 23, 1917	B. & O. R. R. Co.		Howard and Ostend Streets					Auto truck struck by engine.
Nov. 5, 1917	Penna. R. R. Co.		Wagner's Point, Baltimore				2	Auto collided with train.
Nov. 6, 1917	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; watchman					1	Auto struck by freight train.
Nov. 15, 1917	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Virginia Lane, Cumberland				2	Auto struck by freight train.
Nov. 19, 1917	Balto. & Belair El. Ry. Co.	Public; no protection	German Lane					Auto collided with electric car.
Nov. 25, 1917	Md. Elec. Rys. Co.	Public; watchman	Russell and Bush Sts., Balto.				2	Auto collided with electric train.
Dec. 5, 1917	B. & O. R. R. Co.		Annapolis Ave., Balto.					Auto struck by passenger train.
Dec. 10, 1917	Md. Elec. Rys. Co.		Boone				1	Auto struck by electric train.
Dec. 28, 1917	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; sign	D Street, Sparrows Point				1	Auto collided with passenger train.
Jan. 22, 1918	Md. Elec. Rys. Co.		Between Earleigh Heights and Robinson				1	Auto struck by electric train.
Jan. 26, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman.	Light St., Balto.		1			Struck by freight engine.
Feb. 5, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; bell and watchman.	1st St. and Maryland Ave., Brooklyn			1		Auto struck by freight engine.
Feb. 10, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman.	Hyattsville		1			Auto struck by freight engine.
Feb. 20, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; no protection	E. of Cranberry				1	Team struck by passenger train.
Feb. 21, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Hanover and Wells Streets, Baltimore		1			Struck by freight engine.
Feb. 22, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Bush Street, Baltimore				1	Team struck by passenger train.
Feb. 26, 1918	Hag. & Fredk. Ry. Co.	Public; no protection	Boulevard, Hagerstown				1	Auto struck by electric car.
Mar. 3, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; signs	Isabella Street, Salisbury				4	Auto struck by passenger train.
Mar. 5, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Eastern Avenue, Baltimore		1			Struck by passenger train.
Mar. 8, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; bell and sign	Loysa				1	Team struck by freight train.

Mar. 18, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; signs	Henderson	1	Auto struck by passenger train.
Mar. 19, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Ridgely Street, Baltimore	11	Electric car struck by freight engine.
Mar. 30, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; bell and sign	Courtney's, Aberdeen	1	Team struck by passenger train.
Apr. 3, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	Orangeville	2	Auto at
Apr. 4, 1918	United Rys. & Elec. Co.	Public; no protection	York Road & Oakland Ave.	1	Struck
Apr. 28, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Virginia Ave., Cumberland	1	Struck
Apr. 29, 1918	Md. Elec. Rys. Co.	Public; no protection	Glenburnie	1	Auto at
May 1, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	West Baltimore Station	1	car
May 2, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; bell and sign	Hampstead	2	Struck by train.
May 8, 1918	W., B. & A. El. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	Lintheum	1	Auto struck by freight train.
May 8, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	Third Street, Frederick	1	Auto struck by freight train.
May 13, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	1st St and 3d. Ave., Canton	1	Electric car collided with freight train.
May 25, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Seyern	1	Auto struck by passenger train.
May 25, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; signs	N. of Cordova	1	Auto struck by passenger train.
May 28, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Magnolia	2	Auto struck by passenger train.
June 1, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	Bladensburg	1	Auto truck struck by passenger train.
June 6, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Cumberland Yard	1	Team struck by passenger train.
June 11, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; sign	Middleneck, Salisbury	1	Auto struck by freight train.
June 19, 1918	Cumb. & Penna. R. R. Co.	Public	Mt Savage	3	Electric car collided with freight train.
June 21, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public	Washington St., Hagerstown	1	Team struck by freight train.
June 27, 1918	B., C. & A. Ry. Co.	Public; no protection	Watsons	1	Auto truck struck by train.
July 3, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Private	Dewberry, N. of Sparretts	1	Auto truck struck by train.
July 9, 1918	W., B. & A. El. R. R. Co.	Public	Midway, Camp Meade	1	Auto truck struck by electric train.
July 11, 1918	United Rys. & Elec. Co.	Private; no protection	York Road near Orkney Ave	1	Bicycle struck by electric car.
July 14, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	Lakeland	2	Team struck by passenger train.
July 17, 1918	Cumb. & Penna. R. R. Co.	Public	Kreigbaum	1	Auto struck by electric train.
July 20, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; watchman	Bush River Neck	1	Auto struck by passenger train.
July 22, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; watchman	Washington St., Hagerstown	1	Auto struck by electric train.
Aug. 1, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public	Delmar	1	Auto struck by passenger train.
Aug. 3, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	Sparrows Point	1	Auto struck by passenger train.
Aug. 7, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; no protection	Stonebraker	1	Team struck by passenger train.
Aug. 14, 1918	Md. Elec. Rys. Co.	Public; no protection	Maryland Ave., Westport	1	Auto struck by electric train.
Aug. 15, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	North Point Road	3	Auto struck by passenger train.

GRADE CROSSING ACCIDENTS, OCTOBER 1, 1917, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1918—Continued.

Date	Company	Public or Private Crossing and Protection	Location	Pedestrians			In Vehicles		Remarks
				Killed	Injured		Killed	Injured	
Aug. 15, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Private; no protection.	Hant's, Middle River.	7	..	Auto struck by passenger train.
Aug. 30, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Eastern Ave., Highlandtown.	8	Electric cars collided and struck freight train.
Sept. 2, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection.	Anderson, near Patuxent.	1	Struck by passenger train.
Sept. 2, 1918	Chesapeake Beach Ry. Co.	Public; watchman	Grant's, near Marlboro.	2	..	Auto struck by passenger train.
Sept. 3, 1918	Md. Elec. Ry. Co.	Public	Linthicum.	1	Motorcycle collided with electric train.
Sept. 7, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	..	Haigen's, near Eakle's Mills.	1	Struck by freight train.
Sept. 7, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public	Lawrence Street, Baltimore.	5	Electric car collided with engine.
Sept. 9, 1918	W, B & A EL R. R. Co.	Public; no protection.	Clark's Station.	1	..	Team struck by electric train.
Sept. 9, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Ridgely Street, Baltimore.	5	Auto struck by freight train.
Sept. 12, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection	E. of Gaithersburg	1	Team struck by passenger train.
Sept. 14, 1918	Penna. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection.	Chesapeake Mills.	..	1	Struck by passenger train.
Sept. 15, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; no protection.	E. of Monrovia.	1	Team struck by freight train.
Sept. 16, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; sign	Canton Yard.	2	Auto struck by freight train.
Sept. 16, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public	Light Street, Baltimore.	Electric car collided with freight train.
Sept. 16, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public	5th Ave., Highlandtown.	1	Auto struck by engine.
Sept. 17, 1918	Western Md. Ry. Co.	Public; no protection.	Belvedere Ave., Baltimore.	Electric car collided with passenger train.
Sept. 17, 1918	Wash. Ry. & El. Co.	Private; no protection.	Holmes, near Rockville.	5	Auto struck by electric car.
Sept. 19, 1918	B. & O. R. R. Co.	Public; gates and watchman	Gaithersburg	1	Auto struck by freight train.
Totals...				8	8	..	30	93	

	Killed	Injured	Totals
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company	6	36	42
Pennsylvania Railroad Company	22	28	50
..	1	13	14
..	2	6	8
..	7	18	25
Total deaths and injuries.	38	101	139

APPENDIX V

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.

The corporations named below are operated as parts of other systems:

STEAM RAILROADS.

CORPORATIONS NOT OPERATING.	CORPORATIONS OPERATING.
Baltimore Belt R. R. Co.....	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Pa....	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Confluence & Oakland R. R. Co.....	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Lancaster, Cecil & Southern R. R. Co.	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Metropolitan Southern R. R. Co.....	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Washington County R. R. Co.....	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Columbia & Port Deposit Ry. Co....	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.
Delaware R. R. Co.....	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.
Delaware, Md. & Va. R. R. Co.....	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.
Elkton & Middletown R. R. Co.....	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.
Phila. & Balto. Central R. R. Co....	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.
Md. & Pa. Terminal Ry. Co.....	Maryland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.
York, Hanover & Fredk. R. R. Co....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co.
George's Creek & Cumberland R. R. Co....	Western Maryland Ry. Co.

ELECTRIC RAILROADS.

CORPORATIONS NOT OPERATING.	CORPORATIONS OPERATING.
Balto., Sparrow's Pt. & Ches. Ry. Co..	United Railways & Electric Co.
Balto., Halethorpe & Elk. Ry. Co....	United Railways & Electric Co.
Loraine Electric Ry. Co.....	United Railways & Electric Co.
Blue Ridge Ry. Co.....	Cham., Green. & Waynesboro Ry. Co.
Sandy Springs Ry. Co.....	Kensington Ry. Co.
Washington & Glen Echo R. R. Co...	Washington Ry. & Electric Co.
Washington, Berwyn & Laurel Elec. Ry. Co..	Washington Ry. & Electric Co.

ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANIES.

CORPORATIONS NOT OPERATING.	CORPORATIONS OPERATING.
Baltimore Electric Light Co.....	Con. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.
Baltimore County Electric Co.....	Con. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.
Mt. Washington E. L. & P. Co.....	Con. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.
Patapsco Elec. & Mfg. Co. of Md....	Con. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.
Patapsco Elec. & Mfg. Co. of Del....	Con. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.
Roland Park Electric & Water Co...	Con. Gas Electric Light & Power Co.

FRAGMENTARY REPORTS

The following abstracts are from the reports of various Corporations which were rendered in such incomplete or otherwise defective form as to furnish little or no material for the statistical tables. Where inconsistencies were shown in the figures given, or where information called for was not given, the reporting Corporation was notified, but failed to correct the figures or supply the information required.

1—BALTIMORE AND VIRGINIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Electric railway not yet constructed.

2—BLUE RIDGE WATER COMPANY.

Capital stock, \$28,120. Plant cost \$29,020. Revenue, \$2,814.

Has 1 reservoir, 150,000 gallons capacity. 3 wells, 2 pumps.

1 engine, 50 H. P. Has 98 consumers. 1 boiler, 100 H. P.

3—GEO. A. BOUNDS & CO.

Private electric plant sold to Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Company, Salisbury, Md.

4—CENTREVILLE ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT.

Plant owned by the town of Centreville. Plant cost \$34,300.

Funded debt, \$23,000. Revenue, \$12,650. Expenses, \$14,487.

Depreciation, \$2,500. Has 2 generators, 200 K. W. capacity.

24 transformers. 157 meters.

5—CHESTER RIVER STEAMBOAT COMPANY.

Capital stock, \$100,000. Owned by the Maryland, Delaware and Virginia Railway Company. The Company ceased operating in 1905.

6—CUMBERLAND AND PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY.

Telephone line for railroad operations, but as a convenience to the public allows the use of its lines at published rates. Has 35½ miles of poles. 286.43 miles of aerial wire. Plant cost \$4,223.22. Revenue, \$227.71.

7—DENMORE PARK HOTEL WATER, LIGHT AND HEATING CO.

Private Plant. Cost \$6,689. Revenue, \$3,388. Expenses, \$1,889.

Has 325 consumers. 3 artesian wells, 3 pumps. 3 gas engines.

1 standpipe, 15,000 gallons capacity. 2 miles 1 to 3 inch mains.

8—EASTON LIGHT AND FUEL COMPANY.

In hands of receivers. Capital stock, \$50,000. First mortgage 5% 20-year bonds, due July 1, 1934, \$50,000. Total assets, \$32,440. Total liabilities, \$129,585.

9—EVERGREEN WATER COMPANY.

Private plant operated in connection with a suburban development. Plant cost \$25,315. Revenue, \$1,785. Expenses, \$2,409. Has 2 artesian wells, 2 pumps. 2 gas engines, 43 H. P. 1 standpipe, 55,000 gallons capacity. 1.14 miles 2 to 4 inch mains.

10—FROSTBURG-GRAHAMTOWN WATER COMPANY.

A co-operative water company. Capital stock, \$1,250. Plant cost \$1,500. Revenue, \$433. Expenses, \$165. Dividends, \$225. Has 59 consumers.

11—LYNCH RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

A small country plant having 4 miles of pole lines. Capital stock, \$600. Plant cost \$324. Has 6 subscribers. Revenue, \$6. Expenses, \$48.

12—OVERLEA REALTY COMPANY.

Operates a waterworks in connection with a suburban development. Plant cost \$9,452. Revenue, \$940. Expenses, \$473. Has 2 artesian wells. 3 standpipes, 28,000 gallons capacity. 2 pumps. 1 gas engine, 4 H. P. 1 electric motor, 1 H. P. 1½ miles 2 to 6 inch mains. 78 consumers.

13—N. L. RIGGIN & CO.

Owner of power barge "E. K. Reed." Marine equipment, \$10,000. Wharf property and real estate, \$3,000.

14—ROUZERVILLE WATER COMPANY.

Operates principally in Pennsylvania. Plant cost \$8,057. Revenue, \$1,250. Expenses, \$333. Has 60 consumers in Maryland. Has 2 pumps, 60,000 gallons daily capacity. 1 gasoline engine, 6 H. P. 1 water wheel, 15 H. P. 2 reservoirs, 175,000 gallons capacity.

15—STOCKTON ELECTRIC COMPANY.

Partnership investment, \$7,155. Plant cost \$7,110. Revenue, \$2,205. Expenses, \$1,738. Plant consists of 2 oil engines, 75 H. P. 1 generator, 25 K. W. Has 6 transformers. 50 meters. 105 consumers.

16—SUSQUEHANNA POWER COMPANY.

Sold under foreclosure. Purchased by Frank J. Hoen for \$300,000. Subject to \$150,000 underlying 6% bonds. Sale ratified by Court May 2, 1914. On account of litigation reorganization plans have not been perfected.

17—TERMINAL HEATING AND FREEZING COMPANY.

Capital stock, common, \$794,400. Capital stock, preferred, \$675,000. First mortgage 5% 20-year gold bonds outstanding, \$399,000. Collateral trust notes 6% outstanding, \$50,000. Revenue from steam heating, \$125,451. Operating expenses, \$98,138. Taxes, \$4,457. Interest, \$5,369. Net income from heating operations, \$17,486.

●

18—UNION TRANSFER COMPANY.

Incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania in February, 1867. Investment in State of Maryland, \$55,175. Operating revenue in Maryland, \$51,747. Operating expenses in Maryland, \$54,938. Deficit from operation, \$3,191.

19—WASHINGTON COUNTY WATER COMPANY.

Sold all its physical property to the municipality of Hagerstown in April, 1918.

20—WEEMS STEAMBOAT COMPANY.

Capital stock, \$600,000. Owned by the Maryland, Delaware and Virginia Railway Company. The Company ceased operating in 1905.

21—WAYNESBORO ELECTRIC COMPANY.

Statement December 31, 1917. Assets, \$173,083. Liabilities, \$143,894. Surplus, \$29,189. Distributes electricity in Pen-Mar, Md. Investment in Maryland, \$5,210. Revenue in Maryland, \$1,523. Expenses in Maryland, \$1,385.

22—WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY OF BALTIMORE CITY.

Operated as part of the Western Union Telegraph Company System. Capital stock, \$60,000. Has 1,056½ miles of pole lines. 17,433 miles of aerial wire. 1,233 miles underground wire. 9½ miles submarine wire. 14⅔ miles single duct. Revenue from intrastate business, \$38,315. Expenses in Maryland not separated in system accounts.

CORPORATIONS NOT REPORTING

STEAM RAILROADS:

Preston Railroad Company.

ELECTRIC RAILWAYS:

Baltimore and Belair Electric Railway Company.

North Beach Railway Company.

Washington and Great Falls Railway and Power Company.

Washington and Maryland Railway Company.

ELECTRIC COMPANIES:

Bel Air Electric Company.

Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Company.

Gilpins Falls Electric Company.

Mayor and City Council of Laurel.

New Windsor Electric Light and Power Company.

Port Deposit Electric Company.

Geo. F. Praether.

Everett C. Cannon.

Severna Park Electric Company.

GAS COMPANIES:

Chestertown Gas Company.

TELEPHONE COMPANIES:

Garrett County Telephone Company.

Ringgold Telephone Company.

South Dorchester Telephone Company.

Silver Run Telephone Company.

WATER COMPANIES:

Delmar Water Company.

Ellicott City Water Company.

Emmitsburg Water Company.

Mt. Lake Water and Light Company.

Salisbury Water Company.

Severna Park Water Company.

Linthicum Heights Water Company.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CORPORATIONS REPORTING, SHOWING TOTAL CAPITALIZATION, FUNDED DEBT AND INTEREST ACCRUED ON SAME, AND CAPITAL STOCK AND DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON CAPITAL STOCK, SO FAR AS REPORTED.

Marginal Number.	Title of Corporation.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Total Capitalization.	Interest Accrued on Funded Debt.	Dividends Declared on Capital Stock.
		1	2	3	4	5
32	Antietam Electric Light & Power Co.	\$11,500	\$14,000	\$25,500	\$770	...
232	Annapolis Public Utilities Co.	172,700	177,000	249,700	10,715	35,181
72	Artesian Water Co.	155,050	85,000	240,050	450	3,000
82	Adams Express Co.	10,000,000	20,736,500	30,736,500	871,983	550,000
82	American Express Co.	17,249,000	...	17,249,000	...	1,046,190
2		210,808,797	463,801,323	674,610,120	18,473,948	9,951,675
6		2,004,987	42,212,500	44,217,487
6		3,500,000	6,000,000	9,500,000
2	Co.	2,500,000	1,290,000	3,790,000	65,833	...
2		150,000	...	150,000	...	45,000
12		46,250	...	46,250	...	2,775
16		10,000	...	10,000
16	Ry. Co.	400,000	2,000,000	2,400,000	90,000	...
16		15,000	...	15,000
36	City	3,500,000	3,721,000	7,221,000	186,050	50,000
36		180,000	221,000	371,000
32	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Water Co.	44,400	25,000	69,400	1,500	...
72	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.	100,000	50,000	150,000	3,000	...
72	Bel Air Water & Light Co.	390,000	895,000	1,285,000	45,017	15,600
72	Boonsboro Water Co.	49,500	48,800	98,300	2,470	...
72	Blue Ridge Water Co.	10,000	10,000	20,000	500	300
72	Braddock Heights Water Co.	28,120	...	28,120
72	Burkittsville Water Co.	8,500	9,500	18,000	570	...
92	Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Co.	2,110	...	2,110
		281,400	...	281,400	...	14,070
2		1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	50,000	...
6		200,000	128,500	328,500
2		1,500,000	853,000	2,353,000	57,283	112,033
2		5,333,550	...	5,333,550	...	426,676
2		200,000	...	200,000
12		1,750,000	1,750,000	3,500,000	87,500	...
12		200,000	100,000	300,000	5,000	5,000
12		12,000,000	5,606,000	17,606,000	280,300	760,000
12	Co.	625,000	655,000	1,280,000	32,750	...
32		15,000	21,300	36,300	1,278	...
232		14,385,800	37,905,990	52,191,790	1,763,470	1,246,390
232		100,000	5,000,000	5,000,100	125,000	...
232	Co.	35,540	50,000	85,540	3,500	...
72		102,000	78,000	180,000	3,120	...
232		100,000	161,000	261,000	9,650	...
32		...	24,500	24,500	1,175	...
32		40,000	30,000	70,000	1,800	...
22	Chicoma Gas Co.	65,000	120,000	185,000	7,300	...

22	15,000	17,000	32,000	850	3,000
32	50,000	50,000
52	Co. of Balto. City	10,000	10,000
52	138,600	138,600
52	13,525	1,500	15,025	75
94	100,000	100,000
32	5,000	8,000	13,000	480
6	Delaware Railroad Co.	4,987,275	500,000	5,487,275	22,500	368,982
6	Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.	454,700	1,043,979	1,498,679	37,909
32	Delmarvia Utilities Co.	76,000	10,000	86,000	600	420
32	Delta Electric Power Co.	29,500	22,000	51,500	1,100
72	Delmar Water Co.	35,000	30,000	65,000	1,900
72	Dorchester Water Co.	103,970	103,970	3,119
78	Denmore Park Water, Light & Heating Co.	5,689	5,689
2	50,000	50,000	1,000
32	275,000	490,000	765,000	24,563	12,375
32	20,000	6,000	26,000	300
32	7,500	7,500	600
32	30,000	30,000	1,500
72	12,000	12,000	960
72	25,315	25,315
232	50,000	50,000	100,000	3,000
72	26,000	20,000	46,000	1,200
32	26,900	15,000	41,900	435
72	Frostburg Water Co.	9,950	9,950
72	Frostburg-Grahamtown Water Co.	1,250	1,250
22	Georgetown Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.	10,000	10,000
38	Gilpin's Falls Electric Co.	100,000	100,000
52	Garrett County Telephone Co.	15,000	800	16,800	48
12	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.	2,355,450	2,954,000	5,309,450	144,624	25,275
22	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.	200,000	291,000	491,000	14,850
32	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.	50,000	50,000
32	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.	8,800	43,400	52,200	7,740
22	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.	86,000	86,000
22	Havre de Grace Gas Co.	50,000	50,000	100,000	2,500
32	Havre de Grace Electric Light Co.	13,825	17,600	31,425	468
32	Harpers Ferry Electric Light & Power Co.	29,900	29,900
32	Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant	46,000	46,000	1,860
72	Havre de Grace Water Co.	75,000	50,000	125,000	2,000
102	Havre de Grace & Perryville Bridge Co.	500,000	500,000	25,000
32	Idlewild Electric Light, Heat & Power Co.	17,000	33,000	50,000	2,082
12	Kensington Railway Co.	25,000	35,000	60,000	1,750
6	Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railway Co.	200,000	200,000	400,000
16	Loraine Electric Railway Co.	5,000	5,000
72	Lonsseong Water Co.	70,000	27,000	97,000	1,620	2,100
52	Lynch Rural Telephone Co.	600	600

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CORPORATIONS REPORTING—Continued.

Marginal Number.	Title of Corporation.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Total Capitalization.	Interest Accrued on Funded Debt.	Dividends Declared on Capital Stock.
		1	2	3	4	5
6	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$100,00
2	1,602,500	2,342,450	3,937,450	64,002
6	Y Co.	200,000	200,000	400,000	10,000
6	1,200,000	1,200,000	2,400,000
12	1,164,000	6,144,928	7,308,928	214,688
32	5,000	5,000	\$880
32	83,000	83,000	3,700
36	Co.	83,280	83,280
32	5,380	5,380
72	9,500	9,500	1,425
72	42,500	13,000	55,500	780
72	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.	41,500	23,500	65,000	1,175
52	Maryland Telephone Co. of Baltimore.	1,000,000	1,000,000
56	Maryland & Delaware Telephone & Telegraph Co.	11,120	11,120
2	2,500,000	3,908,000	6,408,000	159,427	300,000
2	27,077,200	7,062,601	34,139,801	357,039	2,166,172
2	143,437,300	91,511,500	234,948,700	3,990,744	10,532,298
12	28,300	13,000	41,300	650
32	Co.	4,900	4,900
42	100,000	100,000	9,000
32	600,000	362,000	962,000	20,100	60,000
72	Overlea Realty Co. (Water).	9,453	9,453
2	26,437,000	26,525,145	52,962,145	1,070,863	1,583,220
36	a Railroad Co.	200,000	200,000
36	e. of Maryland.	225,000	225,000
32	e. of Delaware.	20,755	20,755
32	8,125	8,125
32	75,000	75,000	3,000
32	6,000,000	7,367,000	13,367,000	871,454	600,000
72	10,200	10,200	1,836
72	10,000	15,000	210
52	8,930	6,000	14,930
52	1,000	1,000	250
66	50,000	50,000
92	117,103,500	117,103,500	9,543,993
36	Water Co.	25,000	300,000	325,000	15,000
72	50,000	160,000	210,000	8,393	7,500
72	8,000	8,000
52	500	500
98	Co.	13,250	13,250	1,442
98	13,000	13,000
72	Co.	16,000	16,000	30,000	500

33	Co.	100,000	47,000	147,000	2,364	3,500
33	Co.	12,000		12,000		
33		7,155		7,155		
33		500		500		
33		3,470		3,470		
72		100,000	92,000	192,000	1,840	300,000
33						
72		12,000		12,000		
32		300,000	150,000	450,000		
33			20,000	20,000		
12	Towson & Towson Co.	36,400		36,400		
92	Co.	253,000	3,000	261,000	400	10,120
92	Co.	1,469,000	444,000	1,913,400	22,200	
2		2,100,000	5,812	2,105,812	232	1,155,000
12	Co.	20,484,200	58,639,000	79,123,200	2,416,970	819,368
72		11,745	10,000	21,745	600	1,057
32		6,500		6,500		
33		15,000		15,000		
6		982,680	187,000	1,169,680		
2		500,000	100,000	600,000	5,000	
2	Co.	579,800		579,800		
3	Co.	77,167,128	61,800,653	138,967,851	2,310,238	
12	Co.	4,455,750	5,144,000	9,599,700	257,200	87,380
14		200,000	250,000	450,000		
12		15,000,000	16,466,350	31,466,350	706,894	847,500
12		275,000	185,000	460,000	9,250	
12		50,000	150,000	200,000	7,500	
12		300,350	500,000	800,350		
12		10,360	19,903	30,260	1,194	
22		10,000		10,000		600
42		20,000		20,000		
42		2,000,000	150,000	2,150,000	15,630	65,000
72		20,000		20,000		1,000
72		870,000	345,000	1,215,000	13,800	
66		60,000		60,000		
94		600,000		600,000		
96		15,450		15,450		2,106
82		23,967,400		23,967,400		1,438,044
32		50,000		50,000		
12		250		250		
6	York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.	525,000	150,000	675,000	6,000	

KEY TO MARGINAL NUMBERS

Class of Corporation.	Operating.	Not Operating.	Operated Under Lease or Agreement.	Individual
Steam Railroad Co.....	2	4	6	8
Street or Electric Railroad Co.	12	14	16	18
Gas Co. (coal or water gas only)	22	24	26	28
Electrical Co.....	32	34	36	38
Gas and Electrical Co.....	232	234	236	238
Natural Gas Co.....	42	44	46	48
Telephone Co.....	52	54	56	58
Telegraph Co.....	62	64	66	68
Water Co.....	72	74	76	78
Express Co.....	82	84	86	88
Steamboat Co., etc.	92	94	96	98

TABLES.

STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS.

1. Consolidated statement of assets, liabilities, surplus and income.
2. Assets, with classification.
3. Liabilities, with classification.
4. Securities of all classes outstanding.
5. Funded debt and capital stock, with rate of interest on debt and dividends on stock.
6. Cost of road and equipment and cost per mile of road.
7. Income account and profit and loss account.
8. Railway operating revenues.
9. Railway operating expenses.
10. Mileage of road operated.
11. Description of equipment.
12. Statistics of rail operations.
13. Statistics of rail operations, continued.
14. Revenue freight carried.

ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS.

15. Consolidated statement of assets, liabilities, surplus and income.
16. Assets, with classification.
17. Liabilities, with classification.
18. Securities of all classes outstanding.
19. Funded debt and capital stock, with rate of interest on debt and dividends on stock.
20. Cost of road and equipment.
21. Income account and profit and loss account.
22. Railway operating revenues.
23. Railway operating expenses.
24. Mileage of road operated and description of equipment.
25. Mileage, traffic and miscellaneous statistics.

ELECTRIC LIGHT CORPORATIONS.

26. Consolidated statement of assets, liabilities, surplus, gross income, deductions from gross income and net income.
27. Assets, liabilities and surplus, with classification.
28. Gross income, with deductions, payments, etc.
29. Funded debt and capital stock, with rate of interest on debt and dividends on stock.
30. Operating statistics, for year ended June 30, 1918.
31. Operating statistics, for year ended June 30, 1918.
32. Casualties, classified as to employees and others.

GAS AND ELECTRICAL CORPORATIONS.

33. Consolidated statement of assets, liabilities, surplus, gross income, deductions from gross income and net income.
34. Assets, liabilities and surplus, with classification.
35. Gross income, with deductions, payments, etc.
36. Funded debt and capital stock, with rate of interest on debt and dividends on stock.
37. Operating statistics, for year ended June 30, 1918.
38. Casualties, classified as to electrical and gas corporation employees and others.

WATER CORPORATIONS.

39. Consolidated statement of assets, liabilities, surplus, gross income, deductions from gross income and net income.
40. Assets, liabilities and surplus, with classification.
41. Gross income, with deductions, payments, etc.
42. Funded debt and capital stock, with rate of interest on debt and dividends on stock.
43. Supply and service, classification of, for year ended June 30, 1918.
44. Casualties, classified as to employees and others.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORPORATIONS.

45. Consolidated statement of assets, liabilities, surplus, gross income, deductions from gross income and net income.
46. Assets, liabilities and surplus, with classification.
47. Gross income, with deductions, payments, etc.
48. Funded debt and capital stock, with rate of interest on debt and dividends on stock.
49. Operating statistics, for year ended June 30, 1918.
50. Casualties, classified as to employees and others.

EXPRESS CORPORATIONS.

51. Assets, with classification.
52. Liabilities, with classification.
53. Income account and profit and loss account.
54. Operating revenues, with distribution.
55. Operating expenses, with distribution.

PULLMAN COMPANY.

56. Assets and liabilities.
57. Income account and profit and loss account.
58. Operating revenues, with distribution.
59. Operating expenses, with distribution.
60. Operating statistics.

OTHER CORPORATIONS.

61. Assets and liabilities.
62. Income account.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNTS OF ASSETS, OF FROM GROSS REVENUE AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.			
	ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
	1	2	3	4
1 (a) Baltimore Belt R. R. Co.....	\$12,684,944	\$82,819	\$9,184,944	\$82,819
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	4,374,823	17,911	4,761,063	117,999
3 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.....	770,942,322	58,364,807	738,983,185	61,178,952
4 (a) Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Pennsylvania.....	44,650,788	675,467	44,650,921	675,467
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point R. R. Co.....	348,541	47,978	185,947	25,241
6 Canton R. R. Co.....	979,545	169,990	1,141,779	195,201
7 Chesapeake Beach Ry. Co.....	2,618,878	5,122	4,489,417	106,117
8 (a) Confluence & Oakland R. R. Co.....	331,279	302	331,638	661
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....	6,986,661	595,175	5,933,658	473,077
10 Cumberland Valley R. R. Co.....	14,945,039	1,839,652	7,580,461	747,528
11 (a) Delaware R. R. Co.....	8,340,521	527,408	6,345,770	478,158
12 (a) Delaware, Maryland & Virginia R. R. Co.....	2,147,661	91,857	4,177,142	219,677
13 Emmitsburg R. R. Co.....	92,565	3,347	53,900	381
14 (a) Lancaster, Cecil & Southern R. R. Co.....	402,694	402,694
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Ry. Co.....	5,120,967	17,867	6,479,626	442,499
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....	4,432,305	86,089	4,162,700	39,624
17 (a) Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....	434,690	437,563
18 (a) Metropolitan Southern R. R. Co.....	2,696,388	2,696,388
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	14,934,385	757,451	9,376,624	129,623
20 Northern Central Ry. Co.....	52,032,645	7,177,887	43,442,052	5,040,106
21 Norfolk & Western Ry. Co.....	340,782,132	15,437,770	282,892,979	6,874,017
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co....	105,849,618	23,150,328	69,094,570	5,580,153
23 Union R. R. Co.....	4,897,479	530,858	2,702,364	563,390
24 (a) Washington County R. R. Co.....	1,191,650	10,241	1,501,148	10,478
25 Western Maryland Ry. Co.....	144,223,939	9,776,687	142,670,870	6,629,086
26 (a) York, Hanover & Frederick R. R. Co.....	898,663	16,993	1,379,889	139,698

(a) Denotes that the Company is operated by another Company, and its revenues and expenses are included in the report of the operating Company. See "Preliminary Statement."
Asterisk (*) denotes that required figures are not given in report.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 1

LIABILITIES AND OF SURPLUS, ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF GROSS REVENUE, THE DEDUCTIONS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE INCREASES OR DECREASES FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR.

TOTALS—Continued.							
SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.		GROSS REVENUE.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS REVENUE.		NET INCOME FROM OPERATIONS.	
Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
\$2,500,000							
388,240	\$135,910	\$1,301,168	\$47,069	\$1,435,620	\$105,678	\$134,452	\$58,609
31,959,137	2,814,145	140,039,249	16,980,688	131,944,018	21,538,132	8,095,231	4,557,444
133							
162,594	22,737	294,179	92,340	226,442	124,484	67,737	32,144
162,234	25,211	162,507	101,583	187,717	105,417	24,210	3,834
1,870,539	100,995	113,325	5,573	214,320	9,734	100,995	4,161
359	359						
1,053,003	122,098	1,224,355	189,343	1,039,976	239,143	184,379	49,800
7,364,578	1,092,124	5,015,204	1,127,415	3,411,301	946,453	1,603,903	180,962
1,994,751	49,250						
2,029,480	127,820						
38,665	2,966	20,553	11,355	16,587	9,678	3,966	1,677
1,358,659	424,632	1,016,789	87,677	1,114,227	53,059	97,438	34,618
269,605	46,465	545,187	45,744	497,668	971	47,519	46,715
2,873							
5,557,761	627,828	5,645,984	337,630	4,729,835	731,574	916,149	393,944
8,590,593	2,137,781	2,528,407	1,414	361,201	443	2,167,206	971
57,889,153	8,563,753	69,440,481	7,289,194	50,494,344	10,147,131	18,946,137	2,857,937
36,755,048	17,570,175	34,778,559	*	29,693,071		5,085,488	*
2,195,115	32,532	2,015,398	45,425	892,931	558,013	1,122,467	512,588
309,498	237						
1,553,069	3,147,601	14,500,425	2,248,546	12,859,140	1,926,321	1,641,285	322,225
481,226	122,705						

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	ASSETS.		INVESTMENTS.
	Total Assets December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Cost of Road and Equipment.
	1	2	3
1 Baltimore Belt R. R. Co.....	\$12,684,944	\$82,619	\$12,684,944
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	4,374,823	17,911	4,145,179
3 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.....	770,942,322	58,364,807	382,793,347
4 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Penna.....	44,650,788	675,467	44,650,788
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	348,541	47,978	216,428
6 Canton R. R. Co.....	979,545	169,990	682,877
7 Chesapeake Beach Ry. Co.....	2,618,878	5,122	2,521,900
8 Confluence & Oakland R. R. Co.....	331,279	302	331,279
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....	6,986,661	595,175	5,832,222
10 Cumberland Valley R. R. Co.....	14,945,039	1,839,652	9,810,077
11 Delaware R. R. Co.....	8,340,521	527,408	6,396,575
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia R. R. Co.....	2,147,661	91,857	2,107,066
13 Emmitsburg R. R. Co.....	92,565	3,347	55,246
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern R. R. Co.....	402,694		402,694
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Ry. Co.....	5,120,967	17,867	2,964,093
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....	4,432,305	86,089	4,153,742
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....	434,690		432,956
18 Metropolitan Southern R. R. Co.....	2,696,388		2,696,388
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	14,934,385	757,451	11,656,554
20 Northern Central Ry. Co.....	52,032,645	7,177,887	46,371,194
21 Norfolk & Western Ry. Co.....	340,782,132	15,437,770	275,931,590
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....	105,849,618	23,150,328	89,051,398
23 Union R. R. Co.....	4,897,479	530,858	2,471,622
24 Washington County R. R. Co.....	1,191,650	10,241	1,191,650
25 Western Maryland Ry. Co.....	144,223,939	9,776,687	124,572,408
26 York, Hanover & Frederick R. R. Co.....	898,663	16,993	898,663

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	INVESTMENTS—Continued.		
	Notes of Non-Affiliated Companies.	Miscellaneous, in Non-Affiliated Companies.	Total Investments.
	12	13	14
1 Baltimore Belt R. R. Co.....			\$12,684,944
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....			4,148,018
3 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.....	\$35,944	\$483,961	714,722,714
4 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Penna.....			44,650,788
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point R. R. Co.....			216,428
6 Canton R. R. Co.....			682,877
7 Chesapeake Beach Ry. Co.....			2,521,900
8 Confluence & Oakland R. R. Co.....			331,279
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....			6,658,059
10 Cumberland Valley R. R. Co.....	100,263		12,437,745
11 Delaware R. R. Co.....			7,837,640
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia R. R. Co.....			2,107,066
13 Emmitsburg R. R. Co.....			55,246
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern R. R. Co.....			402,694
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Ry. Co.....			2,972,163
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....			4,243,035
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....			432,956
18 Metropolitan Southern R. R. Co.....			2,696,388
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....			12,807,569
20 Northern Central Ry. Co.....			50,815,421
21 Norfolk & Western Ry. Co.....		25,015	303,257,198
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....		2	99,721,804
23 Union R. R. Co.....			2,645,606
24 Washington County R. R. Co.....			1,191,650
25 Western Maryland Ry. Co.....	66,500		137,133,316
26 York, Hanover & Frederick R. R. Co.....			898,663

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 2.

AMOUNT OF ASSETS ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH ASSETS.

INVESTMENTS—Continued.

Sinking Funds and Deposits for Property Sold.	Miscellaneous Physical Property.	Stocks of Affiliated Companies.	Bonds of Affiliated Companies.	Notes of Affiliated Companies.	Advances to Affiliated Companies.	Stocks of Non- Affiliated Companies.	Bonds of Non- Affiliated Companies.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
\$460,449	\$336 8,500,202	\$2,502 58,534,800	\$201,368,980	\$511,564	\$56,264,329	\$1 25,058,387	\$710,748
825,836	9,827	245,963 164,508	1,066,614 190,380		544,096 232,786	185,491	475,413
853,390		7,068 50,531			35,897	1,002	
900	1,965						
1,007,686	8,510	138,708 2,126,677	269,109 354,673	1	1,367	3,253 2,038,916	1,025
11,827	2,595,396	1,983,422	3	203,001	5,528,267 247,301	4,806 1,834,342	16,822,200
772,537	270,856	7,342,364	173,984				
125,243	638,312	932,012	1		10,760,581	38,257	

CURRENT ASSETS.

Cash.	Demand Loans and Special Deposits.	Loans and Bills Receivable.	Traffic and Car Service Balances, Receivable.	Due by Agents and Conductors.	Miscella- neous Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Interest and Dividends Receivable.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
\$51,585 11,539,369	\$3,437,417	\$8,444	\$16,841 2,652,738	\$17,429 9,613,735	\$55,693 11,259,548	\$57,964 14,677,747	\$52,521
132,113 18,546 22,992		1,770	12,531	244,845 789	13,043 17,303	8,819 1,947	
11,233 459,811 233,229	77,000 915,351		71,611 1,395	11,847 3,589	19,028 148,877	132,548 503,488	9,110 6,897
9,820	37,884 7,000				2,691		
5,128 55,452 67	11,699		5,961 1,748	28,705 27,444	30,512 15,396	17,996 57,329	
316,309 1,182,458 4,214,324 1,085,871 2,249,915	506,224	2,218 974	95,744 1,202,972 797,866	183,998 2,010,750 648,745	160,739 2,254,277 768,073	358,142 9,928,612 1,982,455	104,753 137,682 1,957
1,278,299	31,810	119	1,298,396	325,234	942,331	1,557,229	484

TABLE No. 2

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	CURRENT ASSETS—Continued.		DEFERRED ASSETS.
	Rents Receivable and Other Current Assets. 23	Total Current Assets. 24	Working Fund Advances. 25
1 Baltimore Belt R. R. Co.....			
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....		\$199,513	\$700
3 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.....	\$1,445	53,242,966	92,046
4 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Penna.....			
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point R. R. Co.....		132,113	
6 Canton R. R. Co.....		297,786	
7 Chesapeake Beach Ry. Co.....		44,811	
8 Confluence & Oakland R. R. Co.....			
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....		323,267	
10 Cumberland Valley R. R. Co.....	200,000	2,241,621	4,250
11 Delaware R. R. Co.....		240,125	
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia R. R. Co.....		40,575	
13 Emmitsburg R. R. Co.....		16,820	
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern R. R. Co.....			
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Ry. Co.....		88,302	350
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....		169,069	
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....	1,667	1,733	
18 Metropolitan Southern R. R. Co.....			
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....		1,621,157	
20 Northern Central Ry. Co.....	34,766	1,217,224	
21 Norfolk & Western Ry. Co.....	32,120	19,750,028	40,086
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....	5,793	5,429,460	1,200
23 Union R. R. Co.....		2,251,872	
24 Washington County R. R. Co.....			
25 Western Maryland Ry. Co.....	32,419	5,466,422	4,955
26 York, Hanover & Frederick R. R. Co.....			

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

DEFERRED ASSETS—Continued.			UNADJUSTED DEBITS.				
Insurance and Other Funds.	Other Deferred Assets.	Total Deferred Assets.	Rents and Insurance Paid in Advance.	Discount on Capital Stock.	Discount on Funded Debt.	Other Unadjusted Debits.	Total Unadjusted Debits.
26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
\$4,120	\$10,477	\$15,297	\$9,039			\$2,955	\$11,994
232,292	11,351	335,689	6,781		\$184	2,633,988	2,640,953
			1,118				1,118
	52,167	52,167					
	4,612	4,612	515			207	722
28,851	20,426	53,327	947			211,398	212,345
	262,756	262,756					
				\$20,500			20,500
		350	8,773	1,800,000	248,500	2,880	2,060,153
	715	715	865		10,163	8,458	19,486
79,762		79,762	5,162			420,735	425,897
	17,036,000	17,076,086	32,299			666,520	698,819
	561	1,761	2,621			693,971	696,592
		4,955	32,364			1,586,881	1,619,245

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE AMOUNT

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	LIABILITIES.		FUNDED DEBT.
	Total Liabilities December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Capital Stock.
	1	2	3
1 Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.....	\$9,184,944	\$82,619	\$3,500,000
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	4,761,063	117,999	2,500,000
3 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	738,983,185	61,178,952	210,808,797
4 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in Pennsylvania.....	44,650,921	675,467	2,004,987
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	185,947	25,241	150,000
6 Canton Railroad Co.....	1,141,779	195,201	200,000
7 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	4,489,417	106,117	1,000,000
8 Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.....	331,638	661	200,000
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	5,933,658	473,077	1,500,000
10 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	7,580,461	747,528	5,333,550
11 Delaware Railroad Co.....	6,345,770	478,158	4,987,275
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.....	4,177,142	219,677	526,758
13 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	53,900	381	50,000
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.....	402,694		200,000
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	6,479,626	442,499	3,000,000
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	4,162,700	39,624	1,602,500
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Railway Co.....	437,563		200,000
18 Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....	2,696,388		1,200,000
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	9,376,624	129,623	2,500,000
20 Northern Central Railway Co.....	43,442,052	5,040,106	27,077,200
21 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	282,892,979	6,874,017	143,437,200
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	69,094,570	5,580,153	26,438,925
23 Union Railroad Co.....	2,702,364	563,390	2,100,000
24 Washington County Railroad Co.....	1,501,148	10,478	982,680
25 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	142,670,870	6,629,086	77,167,196
26 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....	1,379,889	139,698	525,000

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	CURRENT LIABILITIES—Continued.		
	Dividends Matured, Unpaid.	Funded Debt Matured, Unpaid.	Unmatured Dividends Declared.
	12	13	14
1 Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.....			
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$11		
3 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	254,686	\$15,000	\$1,177,263
4 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in Pennsylvania.....			
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....			
6 Canton Railroad Co.....			
7 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....			
8 Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.....			
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....		76,000	
10 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	106,940		
11 Delaware Railroad Co.....	203,131		
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.....		650,000	
13 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	515		
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.....			
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....			
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....			
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Railway Co.....			
18 Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....			
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....			
20 Northern Central Railway Co.....	766		1,063,086
21 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	10,712	6,000	229,923
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Norfolk Railroad Co.....		140,150	
23 Union Railroad Co.....			
24 Washington County Railroad Co.....			
25 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	128		
26 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....			

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 3.

OF LIABILITIES ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH LIABILITIES.

FUNDED DEBT—Continued.			CURRENT LIABILITIES.				
Funded Debt, Unmatured.	Non-Negotiable Debt to Affiliated Companies.	Total Long Term Debt.	Loans and Bills Payable.	Traffic and Car Service Balances, Payable.	Audited Accounts and Wages, Payable.	Miscellaneous Accounts, Payable.	Interest Matured, Unpaid.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
\$6,000,000	\$684,944	\$6,684,944					
1,290,000		1,290,000	\$596,000	\$343	\$94,731	\$11,307	\$500
463,801,323		463,801,323	7,656,215	3,357,400	11,797,767	3,604,695	3,290,595
42,212,500	433,434	42,645,934					
					12		
			455,000	19,666	282,282		120,903
1,000,000		1,000,000	133,375	2,438	5,765	385	1,548,375
128,500	3,138	131,638					
853,000	2,596,588	3,449,588			28,190		1,000
	265,965	265,965		8,835	288,072	603	
500,000		500,000				644,047	11,317
1,043,979		1,043,979				1,030,510	872,759
200,000	2,694	202,694					
2,000,000		2,000,000	836,750	182	62,242	42,688	18,550
2,334,950		2,334,950		2,661	49,250	20,604	10,537
200,000	35,897	235,897					
1,200,000	296,388	1,496,388					
3,908,000		3,908,000		58,595	432,996	55,567	52,920
7,062,601		7,062,601				4,087,681	91,315
91,511,500		91,511,500		304,206	3,985,253	524,998	812,691
26,525,146		26,525,146	8,227,773	165	1,850,279	1,236,655	100,020
5,812		5,812					
187,000	22,207	209,207				309,261	
61,800,653		61,800,653		428,233	1,285,545	182,045	87,072
150,000		150,000				575,867	123,000
CURRENT LIABILITIES—Continued.			DEFERRED LIABILITIES.			UNADJUSTED CREDITS.	
Accrued Interest and Rents, Not Due.	Other Current Liabilities.	Total Current Liabilities.	Provident Funds.	Other Deferred Liabilities.	Total Deferred Liabilities.	Tax Liability.	Insurance and Casualty Reserves.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
\$21,561		\$724,453				\$7	\$4,120
3,021,469	\$65,994	34,241,085	\$3,433,047	\$332,244	\$3,765,291	1,039,039	623,291
		12				25,233	
		877,852				342	
	789,056	2,479,395					
8,650	1,319	115,159		1,093	1,093	6,895	
	66,118	470,569		28,142	28,142	405,949	30,900
		858,495					
12,560		2,565,829		37,884	37,884		
		515					
41,831		1,002,243					
15,428		98,481	714	7,545	8,259	6,250	
1,667		1,667					
21,667		621,745					79,763
35,889		5,298,737					
811,812	149,547	6,834,602		17,142,184	17,142,184	3,298,145	
193,870		11,748,910		58,378	58,378	681,745	
						596,552	
		309,261					
641,822	20,221	2,655,068		46,903	46,903		
1,000		699,867				5,021	

TABLE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	UNADJUSTED CREDITS—Continued.		
	Operating Reserves.	Accrued Depreciation, Road and Equipment.	Other Unadjusted Credits.
	23	24	25
1 Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.....			
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....		\$242,481	\$3
3 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....		22,199,745	2,504,612
4 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in Pennsylvania.....			
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....		10,642	60
6 Canton Railroad Co.....		56,629	7,641
7 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....		10,021	
8 Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.....			
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....		860,891	30
10 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....		996,712	48,671
11 Delaware Railroad Co.....			
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.....		2,690	
13 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....		3,385	
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.....			
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....		476,848	535
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	\$1,500	110,965	1,295
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Railway Co.....			
18 Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....			
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	63,917	1,805,806	261,720
20 Northern Central Railway Co.....		4,003,514	
21 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	279,360	18,534,867	1,855,120
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	255,446	3,295,161	80,859
23 Union Railroad Co.....			
24 Washington County Railroad Co.....			
25 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	37,000	332,012	241,540
26 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....			

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 3—Continued.

UNADJUSTED CREDITS—Cont.		CORPORATE SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.				
Total Unadjusted Credits.	Additions to Property Through Income and Surplus.	Sinking Fund and Other Reserves.	Appropriated Surplus Not Specifically Invested.	Profit and Loss.	Corporate Surplus or Deficit.	Increase or Decrease.
26	27	28	29	30	31	32
				\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	
\$246,610	\$146,552			532,792	386,240	\$135,910
26,366,687	7,105,257			24,853,880	31,959,137	2,814,145
				133	133	
35,935	27,606			134,988	162,594	22,747
63,928				162,234	162,234	25,211
10,021				1,870,539	1,870,539	100,995
				359	359	359
867,817		\$1,048,837	\$4,166		1,053,003	122,098
1,482,233	3,652,239			3,712,339	7,364,578	1,092,124
	31,549	1,344,390		618,812	1,994,751	49,250
2,690	203,311			2,232,691	2,029,480	127,820
3,385	25,746		7,000	5,919	38,665	2,966
477,383	38,840			1,397,499	1,358,659	424,632
118,510	222,357		50,531	3,283	269,605	46,465
	32,957			35,830	2,873	
2,346,879	1,196,222	1,199,685		3,161,854	5,557,781	627,828
4,003,514	5,025,062			3,565,531	8,590,593	2,137,781
23,967,492	38,150,836			19,738,317	57,889,153	8,563,753
4,323,212	23,254,888			13,500,160	36,755,048	17,570,175
596,552	230,553			1,964,562	2,195,115	32,532
				309,499	309,498	237
1,001,047				1,553,069	1,553,069	3,147,601
5,021	60,616			541,842	481,226	122,705

TABLE
SHOWING IN DETAIL FOR EACH OF THE STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE FUNDED DEBT AND

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.	
		ALL CLASSES.	
		Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2
1	Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.....	\$9,500,000	
2	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	3,790,000	\$40,000
3	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	674,610,120	41,393,222
4	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Pennsylvania.....	44,217,487	1,089,650
5	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	150,000	
6	Canton Railroad Co.....	200,000	
7	Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	2,000,000	
8	Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.....	328,500	8,500
9	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	2,353,000	290,000
10	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	5,333,550	
11	Delaware Railroad Co.....	5,487,275	
12	Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.....	1,570,737	
13	Emmitsburg R. R. Co.....	50,000	
14	Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.....	400,000	
15	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	5,000,000	
16	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	3,937,450	8,500
17	Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....	400,000	
18	Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....	2,400,000	
19	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	6,408,000	173,000
20	Northern Central Railway Co.....	34,139,801	790
21	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	234,948,700	1,113,000
22	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....	52,964,070	1,501,000
23	Union Railroad Co.....	2,105,812	
24	Washington County Railroad Co.....	1,169,680	187,000
25	Western Maryland Ry. Co.....	138,967,851	14,142,710
26	York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....	675,000	

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF SECURITIES —Continued.	
		FUNDED DEBT —Continued.	
		Collateral Trust Bonds.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		11	12
1	Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.....		
2	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....		
3	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	\$70,965,980	\$26,125,000
4	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Pennsylvania.....		
5	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....		
6	Canton Railroad Co.....		
7	Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....		
8	Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.....		
9	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....		
10	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....		
11	Delaware Railroad Co.....		
12	Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.....		
13	Emmitsburg R. R. Co.....		
14	Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.....		
15	Maryland, Delaware and Virginia Railway Co.....		
16	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....		
17	Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....		
18	Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....		
19	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....		
20	Northern Central Railway Co.....		
21	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....		
22	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....		
23	Union Railroad Co.....		
24	Washington County Railroad Co.....		
25	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	4,500,000	5,500,000
26	York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....		

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 4.

CAPITAL STOCK SECURITIES OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SAME.

TOTALS—Continued.				DETAILS OF SECURITIES.			
FUNDED DEBT.		STOCKS.		FUNDED DEBT.			
Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Equip-ment Obligations.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Mortgage Bonds.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
\$6,000,000		\$3,500,000				\$6,000,000	
1,290,000	\$40,000	2,500,000			\$40,000	1,250,000	
463,801,323	41,393,200	210,808,797	\$22	\$26,700,000	7,965,000	299,750,350	\$7,205,000
42,212,500	1,088,500	2,004,987	1,150			42,212,500	1,088,500
		150,000					
		200,000					
1,000,000		1,000,000				1,000,000	
128,500	8,500	200,000				128,500	
853,000	299,000	1,500,000		76,000	76,000	777,000	223,000
		5,333,550					
500,000		4,987,275				500,000	
1,043,979		526,758				1,043,979	
		50,000					
200,000		200,000				200,000	
2,000,000		3,000,000				2,000,000	
2,334,950	8,500	1,602,500		35,500	8,500	1,099,450	
200,000		200,000				200,000	
1,200,000		1,200,000				1,200,000	
3,908,000	173,000	2,500,000		500,000	100,000	2,600,000	
7,062,601	750	27,077,200				6,820,000	
91,511,500	2,383,000	143,437,200	1,270,000	6,992,000	1,113,000	83,226,500	
26,525,145	1,501,000	26,438,925				19,770,000	
5,812		2,100,000					
187,000	187,000	982,680				187,000	187,000
61,800,653	3,596,390	77,167,198	17,739,100	7,052,010	3,367,928	50,202,800	1,550,800
150,000		525,000				150,000	

DETAILS OF SECURITIES—Continued.

FUNDED DEBT—Continued.				STOCKS.			
Income Bonds.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Miscel-laneous Obligations.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Common Stock.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Preferred Stock.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
		\$40,000		\$3,500,000			
		66,384,993	\$98,200	1,000,000		\$1,500,000	
				151,945,618	\$25	58,863,179	\$3
				2,004,987	1,150		
				150,000			
				200,000			
				1,000,000			
				200,000			
				1,500,000			
				4,848,650		484,900	
				4,987,275			
				526,758			
				50,000			
				200,000			
				1,500,000		1,500,000	
\$900,000		300,000		1,602,500			
				200,000			
				1,200,000			
808,000	\$73,000			2,500,000			
		242,601		27,077,200			
		1,293,000	1,270,000	120,445,400	1,270,000	22,991,800	
		6,755,146	1,501,000	26,438,925			
		5,812		2,100,000			
				982,680			
		45,843	3,015,118	49,426,098	3,000	27,741,100	17,742,100
				525,000			

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE STREAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL FUNDED DEBT AND AS ARE HELD BY THE ISSUING CORPORATION), THE RATE PER CENT. AND DATES OF PAYMENT OF INTEREST

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	FUNDED DEBT.			
	PRINCIPAL.			
	Description of Bonds.	Rate.	Date of Maturity.	Amount Outstanding.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1890	1900	\$6,000,000
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.	1st Mortgage...	1894	1934	1,250,000
	Real Estate	1909	1919	
	Prior Lien.	1898	1925	7
3 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1898	1948	8
	Convertible	1913	1933	6
	R. "	1915	1935	6
	R.	Various	Various	
	G.	Various	Various	
	E.	1912	1922	
	E.	1913	1923	
	E.	1916	1926	
	E.	1917	1927	1
	E.	1910	1920	
Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railway Co.	C.	1905	1920	
George's Creek Coal & Iron Co.	E.	1911	1921	
Jamison Coal & Coke Co.	E.	1918	1921	
South Western Division	C.	1899	1925	4
Pittsburgh Junction & Middle Division.	1st Mortgage...	1898	1925	
Pittsburgh, Lake Erie & West Virginia System.	Refunding	1901	1941	4
Central Ohio Railroad Co.	Con'd 1st Mtge.	1886	1930	
Cleveland, Loraine & Wheeling Railway Co.	General	1896	1926	
	Con'd Refunding	1900	1930	
	1st Consol.	1893	1933	
Cleveland Terminal & Valley Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1895	1995	
Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railway Co.	1st & Refunding.	1909	1959	
	General	1892	1942	
	2nd Mortgage...	1887	1937	
Ellwood Short Line Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1892	1922	
Huntington & Big Sandy Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1892	1923	
Hampshire Southern Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1909	1934	
Monongahela River Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1889	1919	
Ohio & Little Kanawha Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1900	1950	
Ohio River Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1886	1936	
	General	1887	1937	
Piqua & Troy Branch Railroad.	1st Mortgage...	1900	1939	
Pittsburgh Junction Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1882	1922	934,000
Pittsburgh, Cleveland & Toledo Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1882	1922	441,000
Ravenswood, Spencer & Glendale Railway Co.	1st Mortgage...	1890	1920	361,000
Schuylkill River & East Side Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1903	1935	5,000,000
West Virginia & Pittsburgh Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1890	1980	3,864,000
Toledo-Cincinnati Division	1st Lien	1917	1959	10,974,000
	Gold Notes	1917	1918	7,500,000
	Gold Notes	1917	1919	7,500,000
4 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.				
5 Canton Railroad Co.				
6 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.	1st Mortgage...	1898	1923	1,000,000
7 Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1890	1914	120,000
	Refunding	1916	1935	8,500
8 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1891	1921	1,000,000
Somerset Coal Co.	Equipment	1906	1918	75,000
9 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.				
10 Delaware Railroad Co.	General	1892	1932	500,000
11 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1913	1922	658,979
Junction & Breakwater Railroad Co.	1st Mtge. Ext.	1867	1932	185,000
Breakwater & Frankford Railroad Co.	1st Mtge. Ext.	1879	1932	200,000
12 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.				
13 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.	1st Mortgage...	1895	1925	200,000

No. 5.

CAPITAL STOCK OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917 (EXCLUSIVE OF SUCH FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK ON FUNDED DEBT AND THE RATE PER CENT. AND AMOUNT OF DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON CAPITAL STOCK.

FUNDED DEBT—Cont.		CAPITAL STOCK.					
INTEREST.		COMMON.			PREFERRED.		
Rate Per Cent.	Dates When Payable.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
5	M. & N.	\$3,500,000					
5	M. & S.	1,000,000			\$1,500,000		
5	J. & J.						
3½	J. & J.	151,945,618	\$7,597,147	5	58,863,179	\$2,354,527	4
4	A. & O.						
4½	M. & S.						
5	J. & D.						
Various	Various						
Various	Various						
4½	F. & A.						
4½	A. & O.						
4½	M. & N.						
4½	A. & O.						
5	J. & D.						
4½	J. & D.						
5	M. & N.						
4½	M. & N.						
3½	J. & J.						
3½	M. & N.						
4	M. & N.						
4½	M. & S.						
5	J. & D.						
4½	J. & J.						
5	A. & O.						
4	M. & N.						
4	J. & J.						
5	J. & D.						
4½	J. & J.						
5	J. & D.						
6	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
5	F. & A.						
5	M. & S.						
5	J. & D.						
5	A. & O.						
4	M. & N.						
6	J. & J.						
6	A. & O.						
6	F. & A.						
4	J. & D.						
4	A. & O.						
4	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
		150,000	45,000	30			
		200,000					
5	J. & J.	1,000,000					
5	M. & N.	200,000					
5	J. & D.						
5	M. & N.	1,500,000	112,003	7.47			
5	J. & D.						
		4,848,650	387,884	8	484,900	38,792	8
4½	J. & J.	4,987,275	398,892	8			
4	M. & N.	526,758					
3	J. & J.						
3	J. & J.						
		50,000	1,000	2			
5	M. & S.	200,000					

TABLE No. 5

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		FUNDED DEBT.			
		PRINCIPAL.			
		Description of Bonds.	Date.	Date of Maturity.	Amount Outstanding.
		1	2	3	4
14	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1905	1955	\$2,000,000
15	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1901	1951	897,000
		Income	1901	1950	900,000
		Conver. Notes..	1913	1923	300,000
		Equipment.....	1910	1921	9,000
		Equipment.....	1913	1924	26,500
	York & Peach Bottom Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1882	1932	202,450
16	Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1906	1936	200,000
17	Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1894	1944	1,200,000
18	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	Income.....	1899	1939	808,000
		1st Mortgage...	1899	1939	2,600,000
		Equipment.....	1912	1913-1923	500,000
19	Northern Central Railway Co.....	State of Md....	1855	1,500,000
		General Series A.	1876	1926	2,561,000
		General Series B.	1882	1926	990,000
		General Series E.	1885	1925	1,757,000
		Ground Rents...	Various	242,601
20	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	General.....	1881	1931	7,256,000
		New Riv. Div...	1882	1932	2,000,000
		Imp. & Ext.....	1883	1934	5,000,000
		1st Cons'd.....	1896	1996	40,387,500
		Div. 1st Lien G'l	1904	1944	23,000,000
		Convertible.....	1907	1932	291,000
		Convertible.....	1912	1932	124,000
		Convertible.....	1913	1938	878,000
		Equipment.....	1914	1915-1924	6,992,000
	Sciota Valley & New England R. R. Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1889	1989	5,000,000
	Columbus Connecting & Terminal Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1891	1922	583,000
21	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad.....	1st Mortgage...	1904-1913	1943	16,070,000
		Debenture.....	1909	1916-1924	3,500,000
		Ground Rents...	Various	Various	325,146
	Philadelphia & Baltimore Central Railroad Co.....	1st Gold.....	1911	1951	2,200,000
	Philadelphia, Washington & Baltimore Railroad Co.	Debenture.....	1887	1922	1,000,000
		Debenture.....	1891	1926	930,000
		Debenture.....	1892	1932	1,000,000
	Columbia & Port Deposit Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1890	1940	1,500,000
22	Union Railroad Co.....	Ground Rents...	5,812
23	Washington County Railroad Co.....	Rf'd & Gen'l...	1917	1995	187,000
24	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1902	1952	46,566,000
		Coll. Trust Notes	4,500,000
		Equipment.....	1916	1926	81,000
		Equipment.....	1916	1926	381,000
		Equipment.....	1916	1926	1,892,324
		Equipment.....	1917	1927	1,059,579
		Equipment.....	1917	1927	3,198,166
		Equipment.....	1917	1927	439,940
		Contract.....	1916	1921	45,843
	Potomac Valley Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1891	1941	1,009,000
	Coal & Iron Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1900	1920	1,000,000
	Baltimore & Cumberland Valley Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1879	1929	46,500
	Baltimore, Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1879	1929	67,300
	Baltimore & Harrisburg Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1886	1936	690,000
	Baltimore & Harrisburg Railway Company (W. E.)	1st Mortgage...	1888	1938	209,000
	Western Maryland Terminal Co.....	Notes.....	1913	1918	500,000
	Hazard Wharf Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1904	1924	115,000
25	York, Hanover & Frederick Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage...	1897	1927	150,000

—Continued.

FUNDED DEBT—Cont.		CAPITAL STOCK.					
INTEREST.		COMMON.			PREFERRED.		
Rate Per Cent.	Dates When Payable.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
5	F. & A.	\$1,500,000			\$1,500,000		
4	M. & S.	1,602,500					
4	A. & O.						
6	J. & J.						
5	A. & O.						
5	J. & J.						
5	M. & N.						
5	M. & N.	200,000					
5	J. & D.	1,200,000					
4	M. & N.	2,500,000	\$300,000	12			
4	J. & J.	27,077,200	2,166,172	8			
4	J. & D.						
6	Quarterly						
5	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
4½	A. & O.						
Various	Various						
6	M. & N.	120,445,400	9,632,620	8	22,991,800	\$919,677	4
6	A. & O.						
6	F. & A.						
4	A. & O.						
4	J. & J.						
4	J. & D.						
4	M. & S.						
4½	M. & S.						
4½	F. & A.						
4	M. & N.						
5	J. & J.						
4	M. & N.	26,437,000	1,586,220	6			
4	J. & J.						
Various	Various						
4	M. & N.						
4	M. & S.						
4	J. & J.						
4	A. & O.						
4	F. & A.						
4	Various	2,100,000	1,155,000	55			
5	J. & D.	982,680					
4	A. & O.	49,429,098			27,741,100		
7							
5	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
5	M. & S.						
5	M. & S.						
4.52	F. & A.						
4.52	J. & D.						
5	Monthly						
5	J. & J.						
5	F. & A.						
6	J. & J.						
6	J. & J.						
5	M. & N.						
5	M. & N.						
6	J. & J.						
5	A. & O.						
4	M. & N.	525,000					

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL COST OF ROAD AND EQUIPMENT PER MILE OF

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.		DISTRIBUTION.
		Cost of Road and Equipment.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Investment in Road June 30, 1907.
		1	2	3
1	\$12,684,944	382,819	\$12,529,573
2	y. Co.....	4,145,178	32,680	2,007,036
3	362,798,347	12,447,754	*
4	sylvania.....	44,660,788	675,467	*
5	id Co.....	216,428	18,395	150,000
6	682,877	124,609	248,854
7	2,621,899	4,793	2,495,753
8	331,279	801	329,424
9	d Co.....	5,832,222	603,855	3,183,856
10	9,810,077	690,715	3,272,153
11	6,396,575	511,344	5,143,916
12	road Co.....	2,107,086	92,612	1,865,485
13	55,245	110	41,421
14	d Co.....	402,694	*	402,362
15	way Co.....	2,964,092	2,862,707	1,683,679
16	Co.....	4,154,641	28,540	3,613,274
17	Ry. Co.....	432,956	*	256,467
18	2,696,388	*	2,400,890
19	R. R. Co.....	11,656,554	663,636	4,768,629
20	46,371,184	7,801,835	22,719,362
21	275,931,690	8,572,808	151,440,746
22	on R. R. Co.....	89,051,397	22,022,584	56,736,562
23	2,471,522	31,551	2,206,506
24	1,191,650	10,241	1,002,019
25	124,572,408	51,127,168	*
26	i Co.....	898,663	16,993	*

(a) Cost per mile of road and equipment, exclusive of floating equipment.

(*) The asterisk in this table denotes that the required figures were not furnished in the report.

NOTE—Deficit loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 6.

MENT, AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF SAME ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE AVERAGE INVESTMENT IN ROAD AND EQUIPMENT ROAD OWNED.

DISTRIBUTION.					
Investment in Equipment June 30, 1907.	Investment From July 1, 1907 to June 30, 1914.	Investment From July 1, 1914 to December 31, 1917.	Total Investment.	Length of Road Owned, Miles.	Average Investment Per Mile.
4	5	6	7	8	9
.....	\$449,309	\$293,940	\$12,684,944	7.24	\$1,752,064
\$1,077,649	613,222	182,731	4,145,178	87.61	(a) 31,060
*	295,467,449	67,325,898	362,793,347	2,272.95	103,527
*	42,900,156	1,750,632	44,650,788	267.87	166,688
.....	32,549	33,879	216,428	5.43	39,858
3,358	249,919	180,746	682,877	13.76	49,628
66,370	3,746	43,970	2,521,899	26.44	95,382
.....	752	1,103	331,279	19.70	16,816
418,662	1,578,177	651,427	5,832,222	50.98	114,402
1,596,481	3,155,744	1,785,698	9,810,077	108.06	90,783
.....	566,140	686,517	6,396,575	245.15	26,092
1,671	75,997	162,923	2,107,086	97.64	21,580
.....	12,240	1,584	55,245	7.30	7,568
.....	132	402,694	4.06	99,185
1,269,420	22,682	10,069	2,964,092	77.43	21,907
.....	403,699	138,668	4,154,641	80.18	51,816
.....	176,436	33	432,956	2.45	176,717
.....	293,593	2,795	2,696,388	6.68	403,650
1,297,039	4,298,125	1,293,360	11,656,554	112.00	104,076
10,413,658	7,748,334	5,489,610	46,371,184	144.45	321,018
24,383,021	73,512,713	26,595,110	275,931,590	2,072.47	133,141
8,206,456	11,932,366	9,176,013	89,051,397	395.67	225,064
.....	159,746	103,370	2,471,622	8.25	299,590
.....	17,243	172,388	1,191,650	27.40	43,490
*	*	124,572,408	124,572,408	616.88	201,939
*	818,926	79,737	898,663	61.14	14,698

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	OPERATING INCOME.			
	Railway Operating Revenues.	Railway Operating Expenses.	Net Revenue From Railway Operations.	Railway Tax Accruals.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$1,281,364	\$1,173,327	\$108,037	\$28,199
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	133,613,320	103,024,213	30,589,107	4,455,819
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	258,948	122,633	136,315	31,123
4 Canton Railroad Co.....	158,721	125,943	32,778	3,607
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	109,325	103,127	6,198	3,520
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	862,448	799,288	63,160	59,257
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	4,838,904	2,541,842	2,297,062	470,744
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	20,273	15,630	4,643	509
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	1,011,519	939,339	72,180	12,814
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	534,599	378,905	155,694	18,573
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	5,516,810	4,103,225	1,413,584	286,653
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co. (P. R. R.).....	16,454,736	14,380,195	2,074,541	586,225
13(b) Northern Central Railway Co.....				
14 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	65,910,242	41,161,503	24,748,739	5,095,000
15 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	33,212,404	24,588,247	8,624,157	1,203,339
16 Union Railroad Co.....	2,006,578	225,383	1,781,195	666,741
17 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	13,638,449	9,561,315	4,077,134	524,607
18 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....				12,712

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	NON-OPERATING INCOME Continued.			
	Miscella- neous Rents.	Miscella- neous Non- Operating Physical Property.	Separately Operated Properties, Profit.	Dividend Income.
	14	15	16	17
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$5,549			
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	491,854	\$62,281	\$379,288	\$1,940,306
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	41			
4 Canton Railroad Co.....				
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	12			
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....				
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	20,092			14,596
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....				
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	1,620			80
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....				
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	67			4,362
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co. (P. R. R.).....	77,940	588		851,811
13(b) Northern Central Railway Co.....				
14 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	41,969	57,411		2,099
15 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	156,993	3,960		956,510
16 Union Railroad Co.....	990			
17 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	17,837	414	26,567	46,891
18 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....	1,037			

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

(b) Report of principal company.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 7.

INCOME ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR AND THE PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT ON DECEMBER 31, 1916.

OPERATING INCOME—Continued.				NON-OPERATING INCOME.				
Uncollect- ible Railway Revenues.	Railway Operating Income.	Miscella- neous Operating Income.	Total Operating Income.	Hire of Freight Cars. Credit Balance.	Rent from Locomo- tives.	Rent from Passenger Cars and Other Equipment.	Joint Facil- ity Rent Income.	Lease of Roads.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$1	\$79,837		\$79,837			\$11,786	\$731	
21,220	26,112,068		26,112,068		\$161,470	158,002	831,146	\$10,354
	105,192		105,192		27		35,162	
1,760	27,411		27,411					
	2,678		2,678		698	3,271		
23	3,880		3,880	\$298,351	3,450	906	14,520	
23	1,826,295		1,826,295		20,519	12,156	25,862	
	4,134		4,134					
13	59,353		59,353			3,550		
181	136,940		136,940		9,147	20		
492	1,126,439		1,126,439		3,102	47,990	3,159	
	1,488,316		1,488,316		311	45,099	147,699	
								2,528,407
1,923	19,651,815		19,651,815	2,054,366	197,633	95,724	111,740	
451	7,420,367		7,420,367		300,401	187,110	192,812	313
	1,114,454		1,114,454					
28	3,552,499	\$118,	3 552,617	628,966	47,025	13,905	26,858	
	12,712		12,712					81,797

NON-OPERATING INCOME—Continued.				DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.				
Income from Funded and Unfunded Securities.	Income from Reserve Funds.	Miscella- neous Income.	Total Non- Operating Income.	Gross Income.	Hire of Freight Cars. Debit Balance.	Rent for Locomo- tives.	Rent for Passenger Cars and Other Equipment.	Joint Facility Rents.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
\$1,416	\$320		\$19,803	\$99,640	\$3,095		\$10,055	\$1,789
2,369,222	19,760	\$6,243	6,425,928	32,537,996	3,101,574	\$46,348	309,812	1,210,983
			35,231	140,423	65,527	7,127	31	
3,785			3,785	31,196	29,269	5,470		
18			4,000	6,677	1,826			
	43,006	215	361,906	365,787			70	2,155
79,901	1,995	1,178	176,300	2,002,595	232,132	54,741	7,539	3,843
280			280	4,414	448			
19			5,269	64,623	1,393		11,461	1,058
1,422			10,589	147,529	19,684		184	
70,495			129,175	1,255,614	100,909	6,039	67,546	3,049
13,393			1,136,841	2,625,157	495,218	9,489	84,999	120,724
			2,528,407	2,528,407				
966,862		2,535	3,530,239	23,182,055		12,515	63,491	107,167
33,671		1,385	1,566,155	8,986,522	879,704	101,981	233,512	851,059
7,830			8,820	1,123,275				
49,217	4,130	46	861,857	4,414,474		29,475	16,687	132,866
			80,760	93,472	13,764	5,490	2,670	

TABLE No. 7

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.				
	Rent for Leased Roads.	Miscella- neous Rents.	Miscella- neous Tax Accruals.	Separately Operated Properties, Loss.	Interest on Funded Debt.
	27	28	29	30	31
by Co....	\$156,965	\$38,488	\$244,180	\$66,529	\$65,833
.....		435,613			18,473,942
.....	500	1			50,000
.....	86,525	600			57,383
.....					12,776
Co.....	10,000	44,035			100,000
.....		1,319			66,071
Co.....		104			159,427
.....	2,762,554	221			357,040
.....		930			3,999,744
.....	383,486	13,250	3,242		1,070,862
.....	72,101	1	574		227
.....		17,659			2,310,238
.....		1,308			6,000

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	CASHES.			
	Income Balance Transferred to Profit and Loss.	Credit Balance at Beginning of Year.	Balance Transferred from Income.	Unrefund- able Charge.
	41	42	43	44
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$134,772			
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	1,876,274	\$27,704,746	\$1,876,274	\$456,784
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	22,737	112,250	22,737	
4 Canton Railroad Co.....	25,211			
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	100,986			
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	78,873	78,873	49,475	
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	1,052,720	2,742,727	1,052,720	103
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	3,966	3,064	3,966	
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	97,439			
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	53			
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	545,579	2,388,261	545,579	
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co. (P. R. R.).....	848,048			
13(b) Northern Central Railway Co.....	1,034	3,617,829	1,034	
14 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	18,026,460	18,425,839	18,026,460	
15 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	3,192,542	10,311,806	3,192,542	4,494
16 Union Railroad Co.....	32,533	1,997,095		
17 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	1,641,285		1,477,241	2,406
18 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....	122,706			

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

(b) Report of principal company.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.			DISPOSITION OF NET INCOME.					
Interest on Unfunded Debt.	Miscellaneous Income Charges.	Total Deductions from Gross Revenue.	Net Income.	Applied to Sinking and Other Reserve Funds.	Dividend Appropriations of Income.	Investments in Physical Property.	Miscellaneous.	Total Appropriations of Income.
32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
\$29,825	\$85,006	\$234,092	\$134,452	\$320				
349,067	47,745	24,442,765	8,095,231	65,856	\$6,153,101			\$6,218,957
		72,685	67,737		45,000			
21,466	205	56,407	25,211					
55,346		107,673	100,995					
121,854	45	181,407	184,379	105,506				
535		398,692	1,603,903	1,995	426,676	\$122,512		551,183
		448	3,966					
3,580	535	162,062	97,439					
24	2,727	100,010	47,519			37,041	\$10,531	47,572
903	1,487	339,464	916,150	70,571	300,000			370,571
		3,473,206	848,048					
	4,161	361,201	2,167,206		2,166,172			
11,301	40,769	4,235,918	18,946,137		919,677			919,677
356,338	7,599	3,901,034	5,085,488		1,586,220	134,787	171,939	1,892,946
		808	1,122,467		1,155,000			
168,532	25,630	2,773,189	1,641,285					
		29,232	122,705					

CREDITS—Cont.		DEBITS.						
Miscellaneous Credits.	Debit Balance at Beginning of Year.	Balance Transferred from Income.	Dividend Appropriation from Surplus.	Debt Discount Extinguished Through Surplus.	Loss on Retired Road and Equipment.	Miscellaneous Debits.	Credit Balance Carried to Balance Sheet.	Debit Balance Carried to Balance Sheet.
45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53
\$119	\$396,882	\$134,773			\$1,005	\$251		\$532,792
229,196			\$3,798,574	\$867,965	382,894	363,687	\$24,853,880	
							134,987	
	137,024	25,210						162,234
	1,769,544	100,995						1,870,539
352			112,033			16,667		
462,304					1,966	543,549	3,712,339	
7,030			1,000			110	5,920	
64	962,868	97,439			3,206	324,050		1,397,499
59	2,177	53			944	169		3,284
228,631						617	3,161,854	
3,419,848					20,802	3,452,378	3,565,531	
235,628			9,632,620		54,216	7,262,775	19,738,317	
2,684,786					4,015	2,689,453	13,500,160	
		32,533					1,964,562	
104,597					26,004	5,171	1,553,069	
	419,136	122,705						541,841

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL REVENUE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.		CLASSIFI- CATION OF REVENUES.
		Railway Operating Revenues. Year Ended December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Freight Revenue.
		1	2	3
1	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$1,281,364	\$49,343	\$200,447
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	183,613,320	16,644,439	102,365,163
3	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	258,948	69,534	183,606
4	Canton Railroad Co.....	158,721	99,063
5	Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	109,325	3,396	16,670
6	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	862,448	85,017	800,416
7	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	4,838,904	1,154,259	3,895,540
8	Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	20,273	11,215	11,348
9	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	1,011,519	87,231	91,062
10	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	534,599	44,705	269,579
11	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	5,516,810	322,651	4,238,697
12 (a)	Northern Central Railway Co.....	16,454,736	921,050	11,736,425
13	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	65,910,242	6,460,260	56,381,108
14	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	33,212,404	7,665,979	16,059,017
15	Union Railroad Co.....	2,006,578	44,378	1,496,219
16	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	13,638,449	1,670,468	11,632,163

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		CLASSIFICATION OF REVENUES—Continued.		
		Special Service Train.	Water Transfers.	Total Rail Line Transporta- tion Revenue.
		12	13	14
1	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$691	\$359,206
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	25,187	\$124,018	129,424,180
3	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	183,606
4	Canton Railroad Co.....	102,844
5	Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	108,016
6	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	1,111	858,627
7	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	192	4,780,184
8	Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	19,053
9	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	178	164,014
10	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	109	520,169
11	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	2,442	63,926	5,321,388
12 (a)	Northern Central Railway Co.....	5,562	15,977,705
13	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	21,596	200	65,009,025
14	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co., 1/1/16-9/14/16.....	14,330	32,466,310
15	Union Railroad Co.....	2,002,576
16	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	2,210	13,112,830

(a) Operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type

No. 8.

FROM RAIL OPERATIONS AND THE CLASSIFICATION THEREOF FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

CLASSIFICATION OF REVENUES—Continued.

Passenger Revenue.	Parlor and Chair Car.	Mail.	Express.	Other Passenger Train Service.	Milk.	Switching.	Excess Baggage.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
\$121,836		\$9,265	\$25,732	\$376		\$456	\$401
19,990,255	\$31,999	1,602,279	3,352,975	62,447	\$394,428	1,435,273	140,155
						102,844	
83,144	4,083	1,889	2,012	5		96	117
45,341		3,447	2,472	424	70	5,085	259
717,532		38,741	89,670	3,881	19,431	10,574	4,623
4,395		509	2,023		762		15
59,182		4,447	8,835	97			193
97,702		9,353	9,248	1,987	52,734	79,172	286
801,272		29,656	139,100	3,653	1,996	37,127	3,518
3,297,459		130,567	472,495	41,305	133,329	138,450	22,113
7,023,153		487,668	740,163	16,057		282,924	56,153
14,036,541		512,142	1,376,789	147,288	203,582	54,653	61,967
483,735		9,823	9,645	3,028	11	76	38
1,089,686	8,993	63,031	175,087	11,754	77,768	46,093	6,044

CLASSIFICATION OF REVENUES—Continued.

Dining and Buffet.	Station, Train and Boat Privileges.	Parcel Room.	Storage. Freight.	Storage. Baggage.	WATER LINE TRANSPORTATION.		
					Freight.	Passenger.	Miscellaneous.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	\$237	\$141	\$325	\$24	\$599,807	\$292,469	\$23,061
\$697,087	69,649	36,115	436,327	10,688			
	57		1,747				
	186		63	2			
	144						
	387	1,165	1,581	384			
	278		268	17	534,961	284,474	24,220
	57		560	17			
88,547	3,358	1,231	11,377	396			
	43,394	20,460	107,322	6,370			
161,465	26,508	6,659	93,157	2,953			
	29,554	6,583	48,387	2,782			
11,231	6,714	603	31,776	167			

TABLE No. 8

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		CLASSIFICATION OF REVENUES—Continued.		
		WATER LINE TRANSPORTAT'N —Continued.	Demurrage.	Telegraph and Telephone.
		Total Water Line Revenue. 23		
			24	25
1	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	\$915,337	\$5,289
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	1,077,765	\$60,529
3	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	72,158	218
4	Canton Railroad Co.....	55,046
5	Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	126	66
6	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	2,705	228
7	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	25,754	4,408
8	Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....
9	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	843,655	1,681
10	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	9,644	34
11	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	60,781	16,873
12 (a)	Northern Central Railway Co.....	167,666	6,900
13	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	224,053
14	Phila., Balto. & Washington R. R. Co.....	234,466	20,316
15	Union Railroad Co.....	3,774
16	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	65,663

(a) Operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

CLASSIFICATION OF REVENUES—Continued.						
Grain Elevator.	Stock Yard.	Power.	Rents of Buildings and Other Property.	Miscellaneous.	Total Incidental Operating Revenues.	Joint Facility Operating Revenue.
26	27	28	29	30	31	32
			\$100	\$434	\$6,550	\$272
\$401,632	\$16,343		8,024	1,155,606	3,969,766	219,374
			429	733	75,342	
				831	55,877	
			730	134	1,308	
		\$719		26	3,811	
		9,745	6,725	6,611	56,762	1,957
			480	460	940	
			1	1,594	3,839	9
			666	3,451	14,430	
		3,803	5,007	4,445	195,819	398
65,938		4,053	9,264	81,461	512,829	35,798
3,279	20,211	73,223	45,709	242,373	899,590	1,626
		2,545	16,729	34,020	395,382	350,711
				228	4,002	
337,508			3,674	65,819	523,156	2,462

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STREAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.		MAINTENANCE OF WAY AND STRUCTURES.	
	Operating Expenses For Year Ended December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Superintendence.	Maintenance of Roadway and Track.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	\$1,173,327	\$143,352	\$4,573	\$40,352
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	108,024,213	18,563,918	791,204	9,315,245
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	122,633	58,804	1,102	15,233
4 Canton Railroad Co.....	125,943	71,324	1,267	11,237
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	103,127	9,680	898	11,235
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	799,288	106,632	4,705	46,733
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	2,541,842	502,499	26,973	224,622
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	15,630	9,175	204	2,879
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	939,338	61,382	3,536	30,753
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	378,905	44,813	3,446	55,324
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	4,103,225	660,153	36,990	301,429
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	14,380,195	1,681,944	151,166	1,146,730
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	41,161,503	7,652,771	845,566	3,705,576
14 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	24,588,246	*	239,411	2,020,631
15 Union Railroad Co.....	225,382	19,144	14,154	62,510
16 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	9,561,315	2,045,093	94,424	1,060,206

TITLE OF CORPORATION	MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT—Continued.			
	Depreciation and Retirements of Locomotives.	Repairs of Cars.	Depreciation and Retirements of Cars.	Repairs of Floating Equipment.
	14	15	16	17
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	\$6,110	\$5,296	\$10,637	\$234,657
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	1,222,851	6,903,367	2,612,840	439,423
3 Baltimore & Sparrow' Point Railroad Co.....	1,935	2,722
4 Canton Railroad Co.....	400
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	475	5,784	124
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	11,166	199,338	66,634
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	33,479	177,570	50,945
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	36
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	2,776	2,538	3,993	167,340
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	27,670	13,954
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	24,440	344,473	106,455	181,864
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	217,387	1,200,893	843,254
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	534,024	4,927,771	1,441,252	12,783
14 Phila., Balto. & Wash, R. R. Co.....	382,632	1,923,724	525,038	1,436
15 Union Railroad Co.....
16 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	76,839	677,888	282,156	9,307

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.
* Denotes absence of required figures.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 9.

EXPENSES FROM OPERATING AND THE CLASSIFICATION THEREOF, FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

MAINTENANCE OF WAY AND STRUCTURES—Cont.						MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT.		
Mainte- nance of Track Structures.	Mainte- nance of Ancillary Structures.	Injuries to Persons.	Other Way and Structure Expenses.	Mainte- nance of Joint Tracks and Yards.	Total Mainte- nance of Way and Structures.	Superin- tendence.	Repairs of Machinery.	Repairs of Locomo- tives.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$9,753	\$26,732	\$1	\$3,014	\$157	\$84,582	\$5,641	\$2,327	\$10,199
1,768,178	1,797,548	65,688	354,327	90,773	14,182,963	872,807	674,689	12,385,683
8,453	1,053	13	798	763	25,889	663	4,892
2,470	7,747	133	22,855	546	8	6,157
4,431	1,568	107	280	18,519	947	189	11,862
12,717	6,007	24	2,887	3,358	76,431	8,320	8,511	44,511
21,488	31,570	1,572	11,086	4,422	313,089	19,233	6,871	150,539
883	140	4,106	180	293
6,206	28,319	13	2,467	320	71,614	3,510	1,825	8,360
12,571	2,716	74,057	3,039	483	27,670
33,230	88,063	356	22,667	2,756	484,491	30,108	4,777	203,422
246,895	390,599	2,793	56,136	48,027	1,945,792	156,170	65,393	1,325,901
1,002,350	935,342	36,632	185,284	34,381	6,176,369	262,724	470,143	4,121,312
730,557	377,523	3,913	117,425	265,296	3,754,756	204,748	140,514	2,596,383
21,693	908	34	3,638	659	103,594
106,893	121,796	4,496	37,594	34,698	1,460,107	47,436	48,436	1,303,061

MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT—Continued.

Deprecia- tion and Retirements of Floating Equipment.	Repairs of Work Equipment.	Deprecia- tion and Retirements of Work Equipment.	Miscella- neous Equipment Repairs.	Miscella- neous Equipment Deprecia- tion and Retirements	Injuries to Persons.	Other Equipment Expenses.	Maintain- ing Joint Equipment at Terminals.	Total Mainte- nance of Equipment.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
\$29,576	\$580	\$24,009	\$329,033
46,762	206,682	\$81,719	\$10,754	\$2,748	\$92,954	266,818	\$54,180	25,874,279
.....	44	12	51	219	10,102
.....	2,120	2,872	12,104
.....	15	48	39	264	19,748
.....	1,022	929	353	2,022	342,807
.....	8,138	4,306	17	86	1,629	5,060	1,656	459,529
.....	337	846
15,880	1,697	19,843	227,762
.....	173	13,380	1,158	59,857
100,872	10,999	4,879	257	421	30,904	11,252	1,057,123
.....	70,344	12,304	5,781	866	2,397	33,345	54,832	3,379,203
898	136,084	36,212	833	1,231	31,203	70,680	5,760	12,051,912
243	99,373	42,872	100	304	4,498	44,962	162,968	6,129,797
.....
2,368	27,705	5,183	8,064	129,936	13,230	2,605,149

TABLE No. 9

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TRAFFIC.			
	Superintend- ence.	Outside Agencies.	Other Traffic Expenses.	Total Traffic Expenses.
	27	28	29	30
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	\$6,266	554	\$9,334	\$16,154
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	833,310	748,691	823,775	2,405,776
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....				1,744
4 Canton Railroad Co.....				1,689
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....				4,577
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....				4,179
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	23,728	2,883	28,349	54,960
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....				387
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	4,026	499	7,828	12,353
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....				7,455
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	25,721	13,862	22,411	61,994
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	67,634	58,652	61,988	188,274
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	206,264	197,497	405,962	809,723
14 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	126,950	120,760	136,100	383,810
15 Union Railroad Co.....				
16 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	97,899	92,404	82,060	272,363

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TRANSPORTATION, RAIL LINE—Cont.			
	Trainmen.	Train Supplies and Expenses.	Injuries to Persons.	Loss and Damage.
	40	41	42	43
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	\$24,743	\$6,029	\$155	\$1,243
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	6,042,240	1,669,233	1,211,792	1,940,441
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	13,436	333	14	14
4 Canton Railroad Co.....			305	2,951
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	5,189	3,335	587	345
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	67,932	6,132	1,944	3,316
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	209,120	40,940	3,096	12,312
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....				77
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	16,860	2,596	492	555
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....			560	1,820
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	173,260	36,918	993	67,573
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	883,972	243,191	5,818	9,063
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	2,259,479	570,008	205,481	239,518
14 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	1,607,974	727,996	7,734	10,103
15 Union Railroad Co.....		356	39	996
16 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	756,606	91,666	40,901	45,413

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

TRANSPORTATION, RAIL LINE.								
Superin- tending and Dispatch- ing.	Station Service.	Yard Enginemmen and Motormen.	Other Yard Employees.	Fuel For Yard Locomotives and Power Purchased.	Other Yard Expenses.	Train Enginemmen and Motormen.	Fuel For Train Locomotives and Power Purchased.	Other Train Locomotive Supplies and Expenses.
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
\$10,131	\$37,494	\$1,137	\$4,170	\$1,894	\$150	\$19,395	\$40,136	\$11,402
1,822,719	7,754,265	2,585,945	5,786,377	2,618,422	1,093,177	6,296,233	11,114,767	2,556,889
6,888	4,887	8,880	18,576	7,193	1,440	6,545	8,628	91
2,892	9,414	37,985	19,465	5,335
2,517	5,967	4,456	21,304	3,437
22,853	45,714	49,761	86,985	33,697
114,646	231,597	37,973	112,023	59,120	15,183	182,002	467,924	76,956
180	1,299	1,874	4,406	269
6,673	17,019	5	2,483	439	165	12,814	21,481	4,233
6,649	44,739	12,299	10,071	1,741	45,630	66,359	17,178
117,013	379,670	48,316	112,884	58,450	22,020	121,977	387,577	49,871
672,014	1,939,994	435,671	1,068,498	382,403	217,166	766,581	1,340,164	331,689
880,964	2,273,255	572,374	1,690,789	726,834	320,820	2,824,712	5,908,625	1,368,572
823,182	1,263,688	385,866	985,575	427,984	154,416	1,313,019	2,847,743	607,181
43,280	159	484	35
283,557	563,504	190,983	399,991	148,803	71,068	728,140	967,242	238,941

TRANSPORTATION, RAIL LINE—Cont.					TRANSPORTATION, WATER LINE.			
Other Casualty Expenses.	Other Transporta- tion Expenses.	Operating Joint Yards and Terminals.	Operating Joint Tracks and Facilities.	Total Transporta- tion, Rail Line.	Operation of Vessels.	Operation of Terminals.	Incidentals.	Total Transporta- tion, Water Line.
44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52
\$2,136	\$6,744	\$230	\$3,065	\$170,255	\$406,913	\$122,979	\$10,959	\$540,851
668,263	2,643,615	753,553	16,420	56,574,351
4,326	3,537	266	3,338	81,715
3,826	82,172
319	1,744	49,200
8,076	6,472	516	948	334,348
20,696	52,130	49,975	5,691	1,580,052
.....	702	8,807
1,698	4,465	326	807	93,112	384,155	119,302	10,514	513,971
2,616	4,900	214,566
29,679	599,699	83,871	902	2,288,869
210,848	417,066	538,862	31,270	8,364,066
304,368	615,475	34,524	12,491	20,808,290
472,116	606,977	1,376,062	19,048	13,636,665
23,268	27,328	1,292	1,062	96,175
55,037	166,856	46,493	18,808	4,721,023

TABLE No. 9

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	MISCELLANEOUS OPERATIONS.			
	Dining and Buffet Service.	Grain Elevators.	Other Miscella- neous Expenses.	Total Miscella- neous Expenses.
	53	54	55	56
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....				
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	\$646,652	\$261,955		\$908,607
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....				
4 Canton Railroad Co.....				
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....				
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....			\$543	543
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co... ..			9,290	9,290
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....				
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....				
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....				
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	76,804		2,316	79,120
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....		59,068	7,642	66,710
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	125,485	8,056	92,427	225,968
14 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....			2,123	2,123
15 Union Railroad Co.....				
16 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	10,128	106,909	42,020	159,057

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

GENERAL.							
Administra- tion.	Law Expenses.	Relief Department and Pensions.	Valuation Expenses.	Other Expenses.	General Joint Facilities.	Total General Expenses.	Ratio of Operating Expenses to Operating Revenue.
57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64
\$25,494	\$3,474	\$1,118	\$2,390	\$32,476	91.57
1,712,572	397,944	\$518,775	152,073	287,357	\$27,305	3,096,026	77.11
2,786	161	255	14	3,188	47.36
6,797	325	7,122	79.34
10,694	388	11,082	94.33
33,980	3,287	3,713	40,980	92.68
85,845	13,188	15,552	6,309	12,780	133,674	52.53
1,482	1,482	77.07
15,759	2,305	1,135	1,353	20,553	92.86
18,699	853	3,771	23,323	70.88
99,922	9,723	8,308	3,693	9,978	69	131,693	74.38
230,852	24,360	146,449	15,811	26,708	13	444,193	87.39
652,839	195,952	103,388	103,036	162,369	485	1,217,100	62.45
393,987	69,019	164,121	26,707	41,368	11,278	706,480	74.03
19,788	1,294	1,788	431	2,321	25,622	11.23
218,202	39,346	19,464	23,432	45,910	346,355	70.10

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN, BOTH FOR THE SYSTEM AND OPERATED BY

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		LINE OWNED—MILES	
		Main Line.	Branches and Spurs.
		1	2
1	Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.	7.24	..
2	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.	87.06	.. 53
3	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	1,835.17	.. 452 21
4	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Pennsylvania.	202.81	.. 65.66
5	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.	4.77	.. 66
6
7	26.44	..
8	19.70	..
9 and Co.	31.13	.. 19.63
10	81.47	.. 26.39
11	245.15	..
12 Road Co.	97.64	..
13	7.30	..
14 id Co.	4.06	..
15 and Western of Virginia Railway Co.	71.97	.. 5.46
16	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	80.18	..
17	Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.	51	..
18	Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.	6.68	..
19	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.	95.00	.. 17.00
20	Northern Central Railway Co.	144.45	..
21	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.	2,072.47	..
22	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.	131.22	.. 476.77
23	Union Railroad Co.	8.25	..
24	Washington County Railroad Co.	23.72	.. 3.66
25	Western Maryland Railway Co.	453.04	.. 162.39
26	York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.	61.14	..

No. 10.

AS A WHOLE AND FOR THAT PART WITHIN THE STATE OF MARYLAND, THE NUMBER OF MILES OWNED
DECEMBER 31, 1917.

LINE OWNED—MILES—Continued.					LINE OPERATED—NOT OWNED.		
Second Track.	Third Track.	Fourth Track.	Yard Track, Sidings, Etc.	Total Line Owned.	Line of Proprietary Companies.	Line Operated Under Lease.	Line Operated Under Contract.
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7.24	1.10	1.10	4.96	21.64
.....	17.99	105.60
663.21	126.42	20.30	1,669.99	4,767.30	3,664.11	321.71	1,034.48
149.78	31.21	13.45	256.13	718.44
3.01	4.26	12.70
.....	19.00	19.00
.....	4.80	31.24	2.22
.....	3.07	22.77
8.12	2.88	25.93	87.69	2.70
58.95	2.35	86.10	255.46	88.28
93.49	77.06	415.70
.....	21.74	119.38
.....70	8.00
.....71	4.77
.....	11.50	88.93
.....	21.56	101.74
.....	1.94	2.45
.....	1.01	7.69
92.16	84.63	288.79
135.83	18.48	18.56	209.66	526.98
556.95	3.93	1,373.27	4,006.62
131.22	68.40	46.55	125.27	979.43	415.70	119.38
7.94	3.72	2.07	16.17	38.15
.....	5.72	33.12
69.04	328.53	1,013.00	68.56	30.87
.....	12.13	73.27

TABLE No. 10

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	LINE OPERATED —NOT OWNED.	
	Line Operated Under Trackage Rights.	Total Line Operated.
	11	12
1 Baltimore Belt Railroad Co.....		21.64
2 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.....		105.00
3 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	156.28	9,943.88
4 Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. in Pennsylvania.....	23.08	741.52
5 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....		12.70
6 Canton Railroad Co.....		19.00
7 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....		33.46
8 Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co.....		22.77
9 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	9.71	100.10
10 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....		343.74
11 Delaware Railroad Co.....		415.70
12 Delaware, Maryland & Virginia Railroad Co.....		119.38
13 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....		8.00
14 Lancaster, Cecil & Southern Railroad Co.....		4.77
15 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	5.72	94.65
16 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	2.45	104.19
17 Maryland & Pennsylvania Terminal Ry. Co.....		2.45
18 Metropolitan Southern Railroad Co.....		7.69
19 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....		288.79
20 Northern Central Railway Co.....		526.96
21 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	13.98	4,020.60
22 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....	15.97	1,530.48
23 Union Railroad Co.....		38.15
24 Washington County Railroad Co.....		33.12
25 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	26.49	1,138.92
26 York, Hanover & Frederick Railroad Co.....		73.27

—Continued.

LINE OPERATED IN MARYLAND.

Main Line, Owned.	Yard Track and Sidings, Owned.	Line of Proprietary Companies.	Line Operated Under Lease.	Line Operated Under Contract.	Line Operated Under Trackage Rights.	Total Line Operated in Maryland.
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
16.68	4.96	21.64
87.61	17.99	105.60
247.10	46.75	25.19	80.05	5.23	354.32
2.65	3.13	5.78
5.43	5.43
.....	19.00	19.00
26.44	26.44
7.21	7.21
31.13	19.63	1.93	2.32	55.01
13.96	13.96
.....	118.34	118.34
34.15	34.15
7.30	7.30
4.06	4.06
39.57	5.46	45.03
42.7951	43.30
.5151
6.68	6.68
35.76	17.00	52.76
35.68	8.62	44.30
15.5863	16.21
85.42	88.42	118.84	84.15	4.38	330.71
21.98	16.17	38.15
23.72	3.68	27.40
220.69	45.44	5.30	2.70	274.13
27.99	5.50	33.49

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN ITS

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	LOCOMOTIVES.			PASSENGER TRAIN CARS		
	Steam.	Electric.	Total in Service.	Coaches.	Combina- tion Pas- senger.	Other Combina- tion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.	14	14	28
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	2,312	9	2,321	611	118	62
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	2	2
4 Canton Railroad Co.....	3	3
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	6	6	19	2
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	24	24	19	2
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	73	73	46	10	3
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	2	2	2	1
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co. ...	9	9	19	4
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	16	16	18	2
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.	45	45	18
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	253	253	94	19	9
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	967	12	979	276	33	50
14 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.	352	352	254	43	14
15 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	252	252	81	18	19

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	FREIGHT TRAIN CARS—Continued.				COMPANY SERVICE CARS.	
	Refrig- erator.	Caboose.	Other Freight Train Cars.	Total All Classes.	Officers' and Pay.	Ballast.
	18	19	20	21	22	23
1 Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.	4	74
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	1,603	1,079	15	90,537	19	293
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	1	10	1
4 Canton Railroad Co.....	1	1	1
5 Chesapeake Beach Railway Co.....	19	2,537	3
6 Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	34	643	1	17
7 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....
8 Emmitsburg Railroad Co.....	2	39
9 Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.	2	167	1	2
10 Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	29	2,082	2	1
11 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.	125	1	9,277	3	27
12(a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	581	47,845	9	241
13 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	150	4,069	4	83
14 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.	127	14	13,654	4	28
15 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	26

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

No. 11.

LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR EQUIPMENT ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, WITH THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SAME.

PASSENGER TRAIN CARS—Continued.							FREIGHT TRAIN CARS.			
Emi-grant.	Dining.	Parlor.	Baggage and Express.	Postal.	Other Passenger Train Cars.	Total All Classes.	Box.	Flat.	Stock	Coal.
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
.....	58	5 364	49	33 1,262	46 32,135	24 1,065	999	53,641
.....	3	6
.....	3	24
.....	2	23	5	6	2,507
.....	9	68	250	66	34	259
.....	3
.....	1	2	26	30	7
.....	7	27	112	5	7	41
.....	9	27	1,903	150
.....	64	186	2,961	6	6,184
.....	11	131	12	513	7,739	636	2,430	36,459
.....	106	417	1,749	136	2,034
.....	6	24	148	1,291	75	37	12,072

COMPANY SERVICE CARS—Continued.				FLOATING EQUIPMENT.				TOTALS.	
Derrick.	Steam Shovels.	Other Company Service Cars.	Total All Classes.	Steam-boats and Tugboats.	Barges, Car Floats and Canal Boats.	Other Floating Equip-ment.	Total Floating Equip-ment.	Locomo-tives.	All Classes of Cars.
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
.....	4	4	13	6	19	14	111
67	16	2,368	2,763	13	152	165	2,321	94,562
.....	2
1	2	3	12
.....	6	7	6	32
2	7	12	24	2,572
6	59	83	73	794
.....	2	3
.....	3	3	10	2	12	9	68
.....	7	10	16	204
1	50	54	12	17	1	30	45	2,163
10	81	121	5	5	253	9,584
20	11	895	1,176	10	10	979	49,534
12	149	248	1	3	4	352	4,734
10	3	92	137	7	7	252	13,939

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TRAIN MILES.			
		Average Mileage of Road Operated.	Freight.	Passenger.	Mixed.
		1	2	3	4
1	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	87.61	67,740	129,452
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	350.73	2,946,450	2,635,247	18,348
3	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	5.43	10,196
4	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	61.38	143,708	69,582
5	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	163.68	802,813	715,500	1,500
6	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	82.62	47,132	88,367
7	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	80.69	56,238	197,322
8	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	112.00	589,781	380,536	1,136
9 (a)	Northern Central Railway Co.....	466.81	2,703,450	2,377,503	21,533
10	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	2,085.47	12,021,595	4,523,877	180,335
11	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. .	746.98	3,493,939	6,443,315	7,632
12	Union Railroad Co.....	8.25	77,736	160,616	3,966
13	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	746.76	2,304,367	1,127,477	84,257

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		LOCOMOTIVE MILES—Continued.		
		Yard Switching.	Total Transportation Service.	Work Service.
		13	14	15
1	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	11,688	214,303	8,384
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	2,462,384	9,654,518	283,004
3	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	55,344	86,619	106
4	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	51,358	336,201	29,865
5	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	281,042	2,084,206	56,508
6	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	3,120	139,025	2,564
7	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	47,459	331,008	2,540
8	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	330,186	1,367,020	35,575
9 (a)	Northern Central Railway Co.....	2,882,206	8,880,272	317,817
10	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	3,857,089	26,149,757	641,794
11	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co...	2,415,597	13,248,544	651,658
12	Union Railroad Co.....	18,628	427,117	13,300
13	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	1,134,524	6,205,933	100,468

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		CAR MILES—Continued.			FREIGHT SERVICE.
		Special Train, Passenger.	Total Transportation Service.	Work Service.	Tons, Revenue Freight.
		24	25	26	27
1	Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.....	719	1,367,807	17,460	240,207
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	304,896	148,659,751	941,770	*
3	Baltimore & Sparrow's Point Railroad Co.....	*	284,966	228	1,892,046
4	Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	9,015	2,027,954	43,942	3,016,573
5	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	5,652	34,023,667	84,554	13,065,793
6	Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co.....	265	674,911	6,204	120,157
7	Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....	1,271,119	1,703	259,423
8	New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.....	3,007	30,658,447	60,188	4,881,103
9 (a)	Northern Central Railway Co.....	9,917	102,752,039	222,975	*
10	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	32,082	598,920,403	3,212,861	48,196,792
11	Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co...	21,292	166,750,502	462,569	22,546,146
12	Union Railroad Co.....	2,210	3,200,246	4,738	8,760,550
13	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	2,661	97,231,935	469,021	16,838,313

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.
NOTE—The asterisk (*) denotes that the required figures were not furnished in the annual report.

No. 12.

STATISTICAL ITEMS CONCERNING THE RAIL OPERATIONS OF THE ROAD, FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

TRAIN MILES—Continued.			LOCOMOTIVE MILES.				
Special.	Total Transportation Service.	Work Service.	Freight.	Passenger.	Mixed Train.	Special Train.	Train Switching.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
159	197,851	7,777	69,045	130,291	159	3,120
29,912	5,629,957	180,316	3,910,878	3,049,917	18,348	29,912	183,079
.....	10,196	108	13,671	*	*	*	17,604
7,975	221,265	12,177	148,198	71,267	*	8,018	57,360
586	1,520,399	43,208	1,027,662	739,572	1,500	740	33,690
53	135,552	2,464	47,485	88,367	53	3,120
15	253,575	2,540	64,721	204,929	15	13,884
694	972,147	35,575	607,728	388,437	1,136	768	38,765
1,371	5,103,857	261,367	3,269,998	2,614,849	24,617	1,414	87,188
7,403	16,733,210	596,266	16,851,319	4,827,394	187,655	8,422	417,878
6,060	9,950,946	561,366	3,751,039	6,840,578	8,582	6,402	226,346
124	242,442	13,300	126,038	278,366	3,966	124
580	3,516,681	82,221	3,185,840	1,158,191	90,445	792	636,141

CAR MILES.

Freight Train, Loaded.	Freight Train, Empty.	Freight Train, Caboose.	Total Freight Train.	Passenger Train.	Mixed Train, Freight.	Mixed Train, Passenger.	Special Train, Freight.
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
516,130	157,682	56,037	729,849	635,423	1,816
81,716,391	47,416,485	3,026,668	132,161,544	15,933,307	69,961	51,892	138,151
177,523	107,443	*	284,966	*	*	*	*
900,760	757,036	163,985	1,821,781	197,158
20,864,409	9,966,003	816,717	31,647,129	2,364,606	1,500	3,000	1,780
248,766	93,716	22,154	364,636	309,480	530
474,795	130,270	55,676	660,741	610,294	84
20,009,691	7,761,281	604,432	28,375,404	2,265,707	2,832	4,640	6,857
62,192,751	24,443,788	2,584,556	89,221,095	13,425,663	46,146	17,544	31,674
356,641,106	201,248,247	11,961,542	569,850,895	27,830,068	731,093	393,090	83,175
83,111,507	38,449,759	3,561,525	125,122,791	41,521,753	8,973	7,934	67,759
1,270,759	683,995	51,525	2,006,279	1,173,590	6,266	12,321	1,370
56,118,844	33,020,345	2,298,303	91,437,492	5,168,489	474,170	143,371	5,652

FREIGHT SERVICE—Continued.					PASSENGER SERVICE.	
Tons, Non-Revenue Freight.	Tons, Total.	Ton-Miles, Revenue Freight.	Ton-Miles, Non-Revenue Freight.	Ton-Miles, Total.	Passengers Carried, Revenue.	Passenger Miles, Revenue.
28	29	30	31	32	33	34
12,944	253,151	4,416,155	437,696	4,853,851	209,343	6,186,164
*	*	*	*	*	*	*
.....	1,892,046	9,454,760	9,454,760	*	*
5,048	3,021,621	35,245,003	55,723	35,300,731	292,856	2,956,422
175,029	13,240,822	690,847,083	6,463,401	697,310,484	1,836,513	34,961,015
5,500	125,657	2,229,356	420,703	2,650,059	114,471	2,608,665
2,424	261,847	7,397,568	90,594	7,488,162	335,240	4,508,371
109,475	4,990,578	534,435,262	5,426,648	539,861,910	778,302	34,326,806
*	*	1,906,957,925	78,428,617	1,985,386,542	*	154,279,530
4,897,966	53,094,758	12,456,970,303	735,024,085	13,191,994,388	8,506,105	321,849,396
1,481,975	24,028,121	1,811,596,714	76,805,177	1,888,401,891	18,888,584	658,252,717
350,758	9,111,308	32,578,499	1,512,441	34,090,940	5,312,777	18,774,179
930,113	17,768,426	2,170,181,675	115,187,746	2,285,369,421	1,847,882	52,437,106

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS STATISTICAL

REVENUES AND EXPENSES.					
TITLE OF CORPORATION.	Freight Revenue.	Passenger Service Train Revenue.	Operating Revenues.	Operating Expenses.	Net Operating Revenues.
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Balto., Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.	\$200,210	\$157,610	\$365,324	\$286,929	\$78,394
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	10,687,322	2,701,290	14,348,198	10,799,424	3,548,774
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point R. R. Co.	183,606	*	258,948	122,633	136,315
4 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	800,416	52,013	862,448	799,288	63,160
5 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	3,895,422	873,878	4,838,904	2,541,842	2,297,062
6 Maryland, Delaware & Va. Ry. Co.....	91,039	72,755	167,322	173,701	6,379
7 N. Y., Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.	4,238,697	979,195	5,516,809	4,103,225	1,413,584
8 (a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	11,736,373	4,097,269	16,454,736	14,380,195	2,074,541
9 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	56,381,035	8,323,185	65,910,242	41,161,503	24,748,739
10 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	16,057,194	16,388,309	33,212,403	24,588,246	8,624,157
11 Union Railroad Co.....	1,496,218	506,281	2,006,578	225,382	1,781,196
12 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	11,632,161	1,432,365	13,638,449	9,561,315	4,077,134

AVERAGE PER MILE OF ROAD—Cont.					AVERAGE PER TRAIN MILE.
TITLE OF CORPORATION.	Passenger Service Train Revenue.	Operating Revenues.	Operating Expenses.	Net Operating Revenues.	Loaded Freight Car Miles.
	13	14	15	16	17
1 Balto., Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.	\$1,799	\$4,169	\$3,275	\$894	7.62
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	7,701	40,909	30,791	10,118	27.73
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point R. R. Co.	*	47,688	22,584	25,104	17.41
4 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	1,632	14,050	13,021	1,029	6.27
5 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	5,838	29,563	15,529	14,034	25.99
6 Maryland, Delaware & Va. Ry. Co.....	880	2,025	2,102	77	5.26
7 N. Y., Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.	8,742	49,257	36,636	12,621	33.93
8 (a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	8,777	35,249	30,805	4,444	23.00
9 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	3,991	31,604	19,737	11,867	29.67
10 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	21,872	44,462	32,916	11,545	23.79
11 Union Railroad Co.....	61,367	243,221	27,319	215,902	16.35
12 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	1,918	18,263	12,803	5,460	24.35

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	AVERAGE PER TRAIN MILE—Cont.	AVERAGE PER CAR MILE.			
	Net Operating Revenues.	Ton Miles, Revenue Freight.	Freight Revenue.	Passenger Miles, Revenue.	Passenger Revenue.
	25	26	27	28	29
1 Balto., Chesapeake & Atlantic Ry. Co.	\$0.40	8.56	Cents 0.38791	13.36	Cents 0.26313
2 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	0.63	*	0.13069	*	0.21316
3 Baltimore & Sparrow's Point R. R. Co.	13.37	53.26	1.03427	*	*
4 Cumberland & Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	0.29	39.13	0.88860	18.97	0.29091
5 Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	1.51	33.11	0.18669	21.53	0.44196
6 Maryland, Delaware & Va. Ry. Co.....	0.06	8.96	0.36596	10.23	0.23205
7 N. Y., Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.	1.45	26.71	0.21180	22.09	0.51553
8 (a) Northern Central Railway Co.....	0.40	30.66	0.18867	17.44	0.37285
9 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	1.48	34.87	0.15784	17.08	0.37263
10 Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	0.87	21.80	0.19319	21.74	0.46369
11 Union Railroad Co.....	7.35	25.53	1.17269	19.44	0.50100
12 Western Maryland Railway Co.....	1.16	38.47	0.20618	14.73	0.30629

(a) Operating report of Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

* Denotes required figures not given in report.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 13.

ITEMS CONCERNING THE RAIL OPERATIONS OF THE ROAD, FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

AVERAGE PER MILE OF ROAD.

Freight Train Miles.	Passenger Train Miles.	Transportation Service Miles.	Locomotive Miles, Transportation.	Freight Service Car Miles.	Passenger Service Car Miles.	Freight Revenue.
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
773	1,483	2,258	2,446	8,351	7,261	\$2,285
8,401	7,514	16,052	27,527	377,412	46,446	30,471
1,878	*	1,878	15,952	52,480	*	33,813
2,341	2,183	3,605	5,477	29,680	6,469	13,040
4,905	4,371	9,289	12,733	193,368	14,499	23,799
570	1,070	1,641	1,683	4,420	3,749	1,101
5,266	3,398	8,680	12,206	253,438	20,298	37,845
5,791	5,093	10,933	19,023	191,296	28,819	25,141
5,764	2,169	8,024	12,539	273,639	13,549	27,035
4,678	8,626	13,322	17,736	167,608	55,625	21,496
9,422	19,469	29,387	51,772	244,111	143,798	181,359
3,086	1,821	4,709	8,310	123,088	8,585	15,577

AVERAGE PER TRAIN MILE—Continued.

Ton Miles, Revenue Freight.	Passenger Train Car Miles.	Revenue Passenger Miles.	Freight Revenue.	Passenger Service Train Revenue.	Operating Revenues.	Operating Expenses.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
65.19	4.89	47.60	\$2.96	\$1.22	\$1.85	\$1.45
*	6.05	*	3.60	1.02	2.55	1.92
927.30	*	*	18.01	*	25.40	12.03
245.25	2.83	42.49	5.57	0.75	3.90	3.61
858.93	3.30	48.76	4.84	1.22	3.18	1.67
47.30	3.50	29.52	1.93	0.82	1.23	1.28
904.42	5.95	89.94	7.17	2.57	5.67	4.22
699.81	5.65	64.31	4.31	1.71	3.22	2.82
1,020.90	6.15	68.42	4.62	1.77	3.94	2.46
517.37	6.44	102.04	4.59	2.53	3.34	2.47
398.75	7.31	114.07	18.31	3.08	8.28	0.93
908.55	4.58	43.27	4.87	1.18	3.88	2.72

MISCELLANEOUS AVERAGES.

Miles Hauled, Revenue Freight.	Miles Carried. Revenue Passengers.	Revenue Per Tons of Freight.	Revenue Per Ton-Mile of Freight.	Revenue Per Passenger.	Revenue Per Passenger Mile.	Ratio of Operating Expenses to Operating Revenues.
30	31	32	33	34	35	36
18.38	29.55	Cents 0.83349	Cents 4.534	Cents 58.195	Cents 1.969	78.54
*	*	*	*	*	*	75.27
5.00	*	0.09704	1.942	*	*	47.36
11.68	10.09	0.26534	2.271	15.483	1.534	92.68
52.87	19.04	0.29814	0.564	39.070	2.052	52.53
18.55	22.79	0.75767	4.084	51.701	2.268	103.81
109.49	44.10	0.86841	0.793	102.951	2.334	74.38
*	*	*	0.615	*	2.137	87.39
258.46	37.84	1.16981	0.453	82.566	2.182	62.45
80.35	34.85	0.71219	0.886	74.312	2.132	74.03
3.72	3.53	0.17079	4.593	9.105	2.577	11.23
128.88	28.38	0.69082	0.536	58.969	2.078	70.11

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE OPERATING STEAM RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURE. (Tons.)						
		Grain.	Flour.	Other Mill Products.	Hay.	Tobacco.	Cotton.	Fruit and Vegetables.
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Other Products of Agriculture.	8						
1	Balto., Ches. & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	6,179	4,531	4,228	1,982	81,568
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	1,879,271	592,899	637,055	338,724	70,188	69,686	629,043
3	Balto. & Sparrow's Pt. R. R. Co.....	567	2,187	558	1,288	988	4,249
4	Cumb. & Penn. R. R. Co.....	1,329	2,064	2,035	636	21	546
5	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	135,155	61,447	70,261	13,302	11,085	46,935	88,507
6	Md., Del. & Virginia Ry. Co.....	7,724	634	1,096	176	20,706
7 (a)	Md. & Penn. Railroad Co.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
8	N. Y., Phila. & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	22,496	26,314	12,519	21,514	5,904	32,209	509,778
9	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	373,841	200,742	165,494	297,154	168,078	48,425	237,266
10	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	300,243	145,358	88,844	101,828	30,445	72,515	1,324,197
11	Union Railroad Co.....	294,306	162,258	40,350	36,414	62,606	114,009	434,173
12	Western Maryland Ry. Co.....	756,709	51,249	51,709	21,378	8,740	37,583	66,364
								42,857
TITLE OF CORPORATION.		PRODUCTS OF MINES. (Tons.) —Cont.	PRODUCTS OF FORESTS. (Tons.)	PRODUCTS OF MANUFACTURES. (Tons.)				
		Other Products of Mines.	Lumber.	Other Products of Forests.	Petroleum and Other Oils.	Sugar.	Naval Stores.	Iron, Pig and Bloom.
		21	22	23	24	25	26	27
8	Iron and Steel Rails.							
1	Balto., Ches. & Atlantic Ry. Co.....	2,907	15,579	4,465	1,478	2,386
2	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.....	352,847	3,023,557	489,069	1,424,709	383,806	72,253	2,039,838
3	Balto. & Sparrow's Pt. R. R. Co.....	6,086	66,432	4,250	9,364	1,160	3,148	55,422
4	Cumb. & Penn. R. R. Co.....	816	11,921	20,875	1,342	276	800	2,426
5	Cumberland Valley Railroad Co.....	91,854	967,431	22,464	85,055	31,195	722	322,627
6	Md., Del. & Virginia Ry. Co.....	504	18,251	1,616	1,443	453
7 (a)	Md. & Penn. Railroad Co.....	91,316	*	29,525	*	*	*	*
8	N. Y., Phila. & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	32,263	1,973,814	82,749	60,509	61,516	2,025	74,150
9	Norfolk & Western Railway Co.....	418,965	2,708,971	494,637	137,801	92,260	3,108	1,475,161
10	Phila., Balto. & Wash. R. R. Co.....	314,569	3,608,721	289,923	461,204	131,466	15,238	456,168
11	Union Railroad Co.....	192,599	1,100,802	141,637	164,258	43,490	44,344	425,686
12	Western Maryland Railway Co.....	116,386	1,060,796	285,089	121,370	64,697	388,736
								34,454

(a) This road is in Class "C" and does not keep the statistical records as required in Classes "A" and "B." Asterisk (*) denotes required figures not given.

No. 14.

REVENUE FREIGHT CARRIED DURING THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SAME.

PRODUCTS OF ANIMALS. (Tons.)							PRODUCTS OF MINES. (Tons.)				
Live Stock.	Dressed Meats.	Other Packing House Products.	Poultry, Game and Fish.	Wool.	Hides and Leather	Other Products of Animals.	Anthracite Coal.	Bituminous Coal.	Coke.	Ores.	Stone, Sand, Etc.
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
373		1,051	1,842	30	112	35,430	11,989	15,607			10,512
455,947	260,943	275,602	37,818	10,606	79,563	49,979	1,786,855	36,407,519	3,468,777	5,096,889	5,979,925
83	24	296	323	90	446	5,092	4,339	149,792	109,126	165,552	541,781
35	15	6	3	7	104	34		2,840,416	183		11,757
63,938	59,358	16,051	11,809	3,080	21,123	12,036	197,220	8,006,274	397,226	67,412	355,688
317		176	1,397	31	14	8,906	4,744	11,124			12,235
*	*	*	*	*	*	1,536	*	*	*	*	*
2,623	758	5,265	15,585	629	4,676	79,330	108,452	37,544	1,677	9,461	79,677
105,205	23,258	49,197	11,884	4,530	41,630	14,878	36,706	29,005,324	2,359,078	1,755,856	2,137,862
131,340	28,345	41,757	44,332	4,917	47,392	432,754	1,876,462	2,286,216	186,621	223,066	1,496,839
35,819	4,500	49,041	22,245	32,285	44,940	325,542	546,386	750,187	143,941	471,514	423,930
19,043	1,265	6,955	3,427	1,155	41,264	94,268	515,473	9,314,365	193,639	85,857	994,924
PRODUCTS OF MANUFACTURES. (Tons.)—Continued.									MISCELLANEOUS. (Tons.)	TOTALS. (Tons.)	
Other Castings and Machinery.	Bar and Sheet Metal.	Cement, Brick and Lime.	Agricultural Implements.	Wagons, Carriages and Tools.	Wines, Liquors and Beers.	Household Goods and Furniture.	Other Manufactures.	Merchandise, Not Specified	Commodities, Less Than Carload Lots.	Total Tonnage.	
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	
752	551	8,880	250	271	190	497	13,812	2,020	8,503	240,207	
1,969,505	4,288,563	3,294,495	40,047	131,718	242,266	75,570	2,873,494	6,052,231	2,089,122	87,435,160	
75,101	74,526	169,327	843	1,004	155	769	55,943	96,071	63,899	1,892,046	
1,844	69	86,615	9	30	8,531	486	2,766	14,392	1,294	3,016,573	
222,100	309,812	168,551	6,166	12,664	9,548	30,406	557,285	229,246	285,451	13,065,793	
384	168	9,374	198	177	49	408	10,346	3,254	3,992	120,157	
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	56,907	1,594	37,288	259,423	
64,648	53,042	65,596	3,938	11,410	3,650	6,915	687,991	80,516	601,534	4,881,013	
456,291	287,277	942,495	26,154	75,941	32,096	131,845	3,194,336	282,424	108,707	48,196,792	
421,635	442,960	618,582	87,831	66,101	20,753	71,121	1,788,190	1,744,226	2,838,677	22,546,146	
195,690	238,565	274,205	33,966	25,477	25,611	57,718	573,525	239,802	689,298	8,760,550	
424,361	150,029	513,868	4,812	21,863	18,088	15,591	697,407	260,311	352,231	16,838,313	

TABLE No. 15.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNTS OF ASSETS, OF LIABILITIES AND OF SURPLUS, ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF GROSS INCOME, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE INCREASES OR DECREASES FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.											
	ASSETS.			LIABILITIES.		SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.			GROSS INCOME.			INCOME.
	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
95	\$4,228	\$143,846	\$13,995	\$24,951	\$9,769	\$14,020	\$300	\$23,789	\$6,773	\$9,769	\$6,473	
27	70,010	2,932,527	70,010	37	45,340	2,799,800	501,620	2,003,270	341,294	796,530	160,326	
63	337,812	18,638,949	292,472	329,547	33,234	640,394	63,133	573,628	37,930	33,234	101,063	
96	67,460	3,752,839	34,246	104,045	9,505	124,435	17,151	109,930	11,859	14,505	5,292	
84	19,974	428,412	10,269	111,636	23,288	175,845	22,938	149,942	18,491	25,903	4,447	
48	71,622	1,370,899	48,334	248,694	58,890	449,460	39,575	387,807	60,659	61,853	21,084	
83	230,285	6,108,646	171,395	178,727	*	10,068	*	11,523	*	1,455	*	
173	*	73,082	*	12,776	*	2,014	*	6,189	*	4,176	*	
107	684,138	9,651,503	4,175	37,453	4,175	580,511	78,252	575,644	50,322	4,767	27,930	
13	5,386	143,411	14,129	32,128	8,743	6,893	1,056	15,636	3,063	8,743	4,121	
10(a)	3,570,612	87,017,529	3,601,032	1,259,784	30,499	10,658,937	650,886	9,781,351	883,423	875,586	232,837	
11	764,215	10,370,903	468,720	515,854	285,495	1,598,592	626,369	1,135,942	310,813	462,650	315,556	
12	1,597	670,128	162	299,513	1,759	1,759	46	1,759	46	
14	540	237,949	13,221	16,912	12,681	20,341	1,521	32,979	10,004	12,681	3,493	
15	31,300	33,066,182	330,000	774,490	296,760	3,017,917	269,732	2,509,938	136,448	507,979	397,180	
17	8,851	604,539	8,170	15,122	17,021	76,161	2,236	93,182	14,047	17,021	16,285	
18												

(a) Operated by another company.

Asterisk (*) denotes absence of required figures on report.

Note—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.	
		Total Assets December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$118,895	\$4,226
2	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....	2,932,527	70,010
3	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....	14,963
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	18,968,496	337,812
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	3,856,884	67,490
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	540,048	19,975
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	1,619,583	71,622
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	6,087,373	230,285
9	Kensington Railway Co.....	60,307	*
10	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	45,118
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	8,980,835	684,136
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	110,283	5,386
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	88,277,312	3,570,612
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	10,886,757	754,215
15	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....	370,615	1,597
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	211,037	540
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	33,840,672	81,300
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	589,417	8,861

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF ASSETS —Continued.	
		INVESTMENTS—Continued.	
		Other Investments.	Total Investments.
		11	12
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$118,895
2	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....	2,932,527
3	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....	14,963
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	17,939,351
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	3,814,164
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	516,509
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	1,557,378
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	\$725	5,624,212
9	Kensington Railway Co.....	60,307
10	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	43,484
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	6,707,801
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	98,167
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	500,000	71,953,862
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	55,800	10,477,097
15	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....	369,843
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	209,261
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	10,600	32,567,040
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	566,376

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.
Asterick * denotes required figures not given on report.

No. 16.

OF ASSETS AND THE DEFICIT ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH ASSETS.

TOTALS—Continued.		DETAILS OF ASSETS.					
		INVESTMENTS.					
Corporate Deficit.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Road and Equipment.	Miscellaneous Physical Property.	Stocks of Affiliated Companies.	Bonds of Affiliated Companies.	Notes of Affiliated Companies.	Advances to Affiliated Companies.
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
\$24,951	\$9,769	\$118,895
.....	2,932,527
37	14,963
.....	17,778,665	\$101,677	\$59,008
.....	3,814,164
.....	509,069	\$7,500
.....	1,557,377
.....	5,018,190	567,955	25,000	\$12,342
12,775	*	60,000	307
37,453	4,175	43,484
670,668	57,423	6,707,791	5	5
32,128	8,743	98,167
.....	70,762,511	67,402	65,175	518,464	40,310
.....	10,042,669	173,230	205,398
299,513	1,759	369,843
16,912	12,681	209,261
.....	32,288,579	6,427	33,910	160,000	67,524
15,122	17,021	491,376	75,000

DETAILS OF ASSETS—Continued.

CURRENT ASSETS.							
Cash.	Special Deposits.	Loans and Notes Receivable.	Miscellaneous Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Interest, Dividends and Rents Receivable.	Other Current Assets.	Total Current Assets.
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
.....
.....
\$64,893	\$348,276	\$15,000	\$64,422	\$124,792	\$780	\$618,163
25,837	1,150	11,696	38,683
7,212	275	15,992	23,479
9,437	27,834	13,739	50	51,061
30,676	177,819	84,887	84,734	\$1,430	1,349	380,895
.....
4	35	1,590	1,629
37,975	15,000	92,264	15,934	161,173
.....	12,116	12,116
671,190	1,820,365	4,000	137,019	890,451	3,420	3,526,445
219,645	625	30,050	46,201	296,521
.....	640	640
482	1,107	1,589
253,554	29,821	85,934	280,152	199,752	1,333	32,685	883,232
5,712	102	14,375	20,189

TABLE No. 16

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF ASSETS—Continued.		
	DEFERRED ASSETS.		
	Insurance and Other Funds.	Other Deferred Assets.	Total Deferred Assets.
	21	22	23
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....			
2 Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....			
3 Blue Ridge Railway Co.....			
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	\$329,091		\$329,091
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....			
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....			
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....			
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	5,000		5,000
9 Kensington Railway Co.....			
10 Loraine Electric Railway Co.....			
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	(a) 1,570,724		1,570,724
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....			
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....		\$5,750,813	5,750,813
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....			
15 Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....			
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....			
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....		20,250	20,250
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....			

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

(a) General sinking fund for first mortgage 5% bonds, \$618,531; special sinking fund, \$952,192.

(b) Includes \$468,700, discount on bonds sold to pay for property leased to The United Railways & Electric Company.

(c) Includes \$3,920,000, past due coupons on income bonds for which same amount of 5% funding bonds due in 1936 have been issued and are outstanding.

—Continued.

DETAILS OF ASSETS—Continued.

UNADJUSTED DEBITS.							
Rents and Insurance Paid in Advance.	Discount on Stock.	Discount on Funded Debt.	Property Abandoned Chargeable to Operating Expenses.	Other Unadjusted Debits.	Total Unadjusted Debits.	Total Assets.	Grand Total.
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
						\$118,895	\$143,846
						2,932,527	2,932,527
						14,963	15,000
\$17,323			\$22,196	\$42,371	\$81,890	18,968,496	18,968,496
1,943			2,093		4,036	3,856,884	3,856,884
						540,048	540,048
11,144					11,144	1,619,583	1,619,583
105		\$43,079		34,081	77,265	6,087,373	6,087,373
						60,307	73,082
						45,113	82,566
483		(b) 536,502		4,151	541,136	8,980,835	9,651,503
						110,283	143,411
21,057	\$2,730,600	250,975		(c) 4,043,559	7,046,191	88,277,312	88,277,312
3,946		67,211		41,981	113,138	10,886,757	10,886,757
11				121	132	370,615	670,128
16				171	187	211,037	227,949
17,672		314,336		38,141	370,149	33,840,672	33,840,672
270		866		2,215	2,851	589,417	604,539

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.	
		Total Liabilities December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$143,846	\$13,995
2	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....	2,932,527	70,010
3	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....	15,000	
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	18,638,949	292,472
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	3,752,839	34,246
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	428,412	10,269
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	1,370,889	48,334
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	6,108,646	171,386
9	Kensington Railway Co.....	73,082	*
10	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	82,566	4,173
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	9,651,503	741,561
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	143,411	14,129
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	87,017,529	3,601,032
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	10,370,903	468,720
15	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....	670,128	162
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	227,949	13,221
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	33,066,182	330,000
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	604,539	8,170

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF LIABILITIES —Continued.	
		CURRENT LIABILITIES —Continued.	
		Miscellaneous Accounts Payable.	Matured Interest, Dividends and Rents Unpaid.
		11	12
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....		
2	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....		
3	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....		
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	\$8,651	\$211,178
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	35,659	2,463
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....		
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....		
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	8,925	10,350
9	Kensington Railway Co.....	9,547	
10	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	2,260	25,843
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	6,717	44,609
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	2,912	17,740
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....		120,365
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	3,945	
15	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....		197,500
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	6,709	11,250
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	65,690	29,703
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	32,505	

(a) First Mortgage Bonds matured June 1st, 1916.
Asterisk (*) denotes absence of required figures.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 17.

OF LIABILITIES AND THE SURPLUS ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH LIABILITIES.

TOTALS—Continued.		DETAILS OF LIABILITIES.					
		LONG-TERM DEBT.			CURRENT LIABILITIES.		
Corporate Surplus.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt, Unmatured.	Non-Negotiable Debt to Affiliated Companies.	Total Long-Term Debt.	Loans and Notes Payable.	Audited Accounts and Wages Payable.
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		\$10,000		\$33,941	\$33,941	\$100,000	
		400,000	\$2,000,000	432,527	2,432,527	100,000	
		15,000					
\$329,547	\$45,340	12,000,000	5,606,000		5,606,000		\$273
104,045	33,234	1,750,000	1,750,000	89,909	1,839,909		2,722
111,636	9,505	200,000	100,000		100,000	15,000	
248,694	23,288	625,000	655,000		655,000	70,827	5,352
178,727	58,899	2,355,450	2,954,000	9,000	2,963,000	369,000	91,172
		25,000	35,000		35,000	450	
		5,000				49,462	
		1,164,000	6,144,928		6,144,928	551,026	16,732
		36,400				73,059	
1,259,784	30,420	20,484,200	58,639,000		58,639,000		226,896
515,854	285,495	4,455,750	5,144,000		5,144,000	200,000	191,498
		200,000	50,000	22,061	72,061		
		50,000	150,000	4,258	154,258		2
774,490	298,709	15,000,000	16,466,350		16,466,350	240,410	104,272
		275,000	185,000		185,000	75,000	309

DETAILS OF LIABILITIES—Continued.

CURRENT LIABILITIES—Continued.					UNADJUSTED CREDITS.		
Matured Funded Debt Unpaid.	Accrued Interest, Dividends and Rents Payable.	Other Current Liabilities.	Total Current Liabilities.	Deferred Liabilities.	Tax Liability.	Insurance and Casualty Reserves.	Operating Reserves.
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
			\$100,000		\$95		
			100,000				
	\$23,358	\$124,851	368,312	\$3,713	\$104,267	\$194 150,	\$2,529
	36,458		77,304		9,140		10,077
	1,250		16,250				
	6,052	1,936	84,167		1,636	1,663	
	36,110		515,557	262	1,431	6,377	
	104		10,100				
			77,566				
	89,470		708,555	1,570,724	5,600	2,000	
		12,300	106,011				
	759,785		1,107,045	6,092,718	160,030		118,026
	16,230		481,674		102,783		51,994
(a) \$200,000			397,500				
	3,125		21,086				1,441
118	114,685		554,878	19	59,402		29,788
	1,841		109,655				

TABLE No. 17

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF LIABILITIES —Continued.	
	UNADJUSTED CREDITS —Continued.	
	Accrued Depreciation, Road and Equipment.	Other Unadjusted Credits.
	21	22
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....		
2 Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....		
3 Blue Ridge Railway Co.....		
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	\$328,941	\$31,035
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	64,971	1,436
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	105,662	
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	3,422	
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	64,963	1,606
9 Kensington Railway Co.....	2,981	
10 Loraine Electric Railway Co.....		
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	37,448	18,248
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....		
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	359,411	57,096
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	133,545	1,156
15 Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....	567	
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	1,164	
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	817,754	137,989
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	34,884	

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

DETAIL OF LIABILITIES—Continued.

UNADJUSTED CREDITS—Continued.		CORPORATE SURPLUS.					
Total Unadjusted Credits.	Total Liabilities.	Additions to Property Through Surplus.	Sinking Fund Reserves.	Total Appropriated Surplus.	Profit and Loss.	Corporate Surplus.	Grand Total.
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
\$95	\$143,846	\$24,951	\$24,951	\$118,895
.....	2,932,527	2,932,527
.....	15,000	37	37	14,963
600,923	18,638,949	329,547	329,547	18,968,496
85,625	3,752,839	104,045	104,045	3,856,884
105,662	428,412	\$6,500	\$6,500	111,636	111,636	540,048
6,721	1,370,889	248,694	248,694	1,619,583
74,377	6,108,646	178,727	178,727	6,087,373
2,981	73,082	12,775	12,775	60,307
.....	82,566	37,453	37,453	45,113
63,296	9,651,503	670,668	670,668	8,980,835
.....	143,411	32,128	32,128	110,283
694,564	87,017,529	192,796	192,796	1,066,988	1,259,784	88,277,312
289,478	10,370,903	\$59,000	59,000	456,854	515,854	10,886,757
567	670,128	299,513	299,513	370,615
2,605	227,949	16,912	16,912	211,037
1,044,934	33,066,182	1,635	1,635	772,855	774,490	33,840,672
34,884	604,539	15,122	15,122	589,417

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE AMOUNT OF ALL CLASSES (CORPORATION), AND A CLASSIFICATION OF THESE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.	
	ALL CLASSES.	
	Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917. 1	Increase Over Preceding Year. 2
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$10,000	
2 Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....	2,400,000	
3 Blue Ridge Railway Co.....	15,000	
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	17,606,000	
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	3,500,000	
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	300,000	
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	1,280,000	
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	5,309,450	3624,350
9 Kensington Railway Co.....	60,000	
10 Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	5,000	
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	7,308,928	457,000
12 Towson & Cockeyville Electric Railway Co.....	36,400	
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	79,123,200	3,000,000
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	9,599,750	50
15 Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....	250,000	
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	200,000	
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	31,466,350	
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	460,000	

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF FUNDED DEBT —Continued.	
	Collateral Trust Bonds.	Income Bonds.
	9	10
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....		
2 Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....		
3 Blue Ridge Railway Co.....		
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....		
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....		
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....		
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....		
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....		
9 Kensington Railway Co.....		
10 Loraine Electric Railway Co.....		
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....		
12 Towson & Cockeyville Electric Railway Co.....		
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....		\$13,977,000
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....		
15 Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....		
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....		
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....		
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....		

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 18.

OF SECURITIES OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917 (EXCLUSIVE OF ANY SUCH AS ARE HELD BY THE ISSUING SECURITIES BETWEEN FUNDED DEBT AND STOCKS.

TOTALS—Continued.				DETAILS OF FUNDED DEBT.	
FUNDED DEBT.		STOCKS.			
Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Equipment Obligations.	Mortgage Bonds.
3	4	5	6	7	8
\$2,000,000		\$10,000			\$2,000,000
5,606,000		400,000			5,606,000
1,750,000		15,000			1,750,000
100,000		12,000,000			100,000
655,000		1,750,000			655,000
2,954,000	\$345,300	200,000			2,074,000
35,000		625,000			35,000
6,144,928	457,000	2,355,450	\$279,550		5,946,000
58,639,000		25,000		\$198,928	34,992,000
5,144,000	3,000,000	5,000			5,144,000
200,000		1,164,000			50,000
150,000		36,400			150,000
16,466,350		20,484,200	50		16,466,350
185,000		4,455,750			185,000
		50,000			
		50,000			
		15,000,000			
		275,000			

DETAILS OF STOCKS.				
DETAILS OF FUNDED DEBT—Continued.				
		COMMON.	PREFERRED.	
Miscellaneous Obligations.	Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Amount Outstanding December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
11	12	13	14	15
	\$10,000			
	400,000			
	15,000			
	12,000,000			
	1,750,000			
	200,000			
	625,000			
\$880,000	1,512,950	\$487,050	\$842,500	\$207,500
	25,000			
	5,000			
	1,164,000			
9,670,000	36,400			
	20,484,200		23,000	
	3,000,000		1,455,750	50
	200,000			
	50,000			
	6,500,000		8,500,000	
	275,000			

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL (THE ISSUING CORPORATION), DESCRIPTION OF SAME, RATE PER CENT, THE AMOUNT OF INTEREST ACCRUING

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	FUNDED DEBT.			
	PRINCIPAL.			
	Description of Bonds.	Date.	Date of Maturity.	Amount Outstanding.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore & Bel Air Electric Railway Co.....				
2 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Ry. Co.....				
3 Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1903	1953	\$2,000,000
4 Blue Ridge Railway Co.....				
5 Capital Traction Co., Washington, D. C.....	1st Mortgage.	1907	1947	5,606,000
6 City & Suburban Ry. Co., Washington, D. C.....	1st Mortgage.	1898	1948	1,750,000
7 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1903	1923	100,000
8 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Ry. Co.....				
Frostburg, Elkhart & Cumberland Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1901	1926	230,000
Lonaconing, Midland & Frostburg Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1901	1926	200,000
Westernport & Lonaconing Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1903	1928	225,000
9 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1914	1944	1,224,000
	Gold Notes.	1917	1927	600,000
	Collate'l Trust.	1917	1932	280,000
Hagerstown & Boonsboro Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1902	1922	110,000
Hagerstown & Myersville Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1904	1924	120,000
Hagerstown & Northern Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1907	1927	200,000
Frederick & Middletown R. R. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1905	1935	126,000
Monocacy Valley Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1908	1925	30,000
Myersville & Catoctin Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1904	1929	35,000
Frederick Gas & Electric Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1904	1929	179,000
Frostburg Illuminating & Manufacturing Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1899	1929	50,000
10 Kensington Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1902	1922	15,000
	Cons'l'd.	1909	1934	20,000
11 Loraine Electric Railway Co.....				
12 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1906	1931	4,946,000
	Equipment.	1910	1911-1919	45,928
	Equipment.	1913	1914-1924	153,000
Balto. & Annapolis Short Line R. R. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1906	1946	1,000,000
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1899	1949	26,450,000
	Income.	1899	1949	13,977,000
	Funding.	1906	1936	3,920,000
	Notes.	1916	1921	1,244,000
	Notes.	1917	1922	1,506,000
	Notes.	1917	1922	3,000,000
Central Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1892	1932	692,000
	Exp. and Imp.	1897	1932	600,000
City & Suburban Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1892	1922	3,000,000
Baltimore Traction Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1899	1929	1,500,000
North Baltimore Passenger Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1892	1942	1,750,000
Lake Roland Elevated Ry. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1892	1942	1,000,000
14 Washington, Balto. & Annapolis Electric R. R. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1911	1941	5,144,000
15 Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....	2d Mortgage.	1898	1918	50,000
16 Washington & Great Falls Ry. & Power Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1912	1937	500,000
17 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1916	1946	150,000
18 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	Cons'l'd.	1902	1951	11,642,350
Metropolitan R. R. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1895	1925	1,850,000
Anacostia & Potomac R. R. Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1899	1949	2,979,000
19 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	1st Mortgage.	1915	1965	185,000

No. 19.

STOCK OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917 (EXCLUSIVE OF SUCH FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK AS ARE HELD BY
ON FUNDED DEBT AND THE AMOUNT OF DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON CAPITAL STOCK DURING THE YEAR.

FUNDED DEBT—Cont.		STOCKS.					
INTEREST.		COMMON.			PREFERRED.		
Rate Per Cent.	Dates When Payable.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		\$46,250					
		10,000					
4½	F. & A.	400,000					
		15,000					
5	J. & D.	12,000,000	\$750,000	6½			
5	F. & A.	1,750,000					
5	A. & O.	200,000	5,000	2½			
		625,000					
5	J. & D.						
5	J. & D.						
5	J. & J.						
6	A. & O.	1,512,950			\$842,500	\$25,275	2½
6	M. & N.						
5	M. & S.						
5	F. & A.						
5	J. & J.						
5	F. & A.						
5	J. & D.						
5	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
5	J. & J.						
5	Mch. Qrly.	25,000					
5	Mch. Qrly.						
		5,000					
		1,164,000					
5	A. & O.						
5	F. & A.						
6	J. & D.						
5	F. & A.						
4	M. & S.	20,461,200	818,448	4	23,000	920	4
4	J. & D.						
5	J. & D.						
5	F. & A.						
5	F. & A.						
6	F. & A.						
5	M. & N.						
5	M. & S.						
5	J. & D.						
5	M. & N.						
5	J. & D.						
5	M. & S.						
5	M. & S.	3,000,000	90,000	3	1,455,700	87,360	6
6	M. & N.	200,000					
5	J. & D.	300,350					
5	F. & A.	50,000					
4	J. & D.	6,500,000	422,500	6½	8,500,000	425,000	5
5	F. & A.						
5	A. & O.						
5	M. & N.	275,000					

TABLE No. 20.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE INVESTMENT IN ROAD AND EQUIPMENT ON DECEMBER 31, 1917.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	INVESTMENT IN ROAD AND EQUIPMENT.			AVERAGE COST PER MILE.			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Cost of Road and Equipment June 30, 1917.	Invested Since June 30, 1914.	Total Cost of Road and Equipment Dec. 31, 1917.	Length of Road Owned. Miles.	Average Investment Per Mile.	Length of Track Owned. Miles.	Average Investment Per Mile.
1	\$113,274	\$5,621	\$118,895	2.84	\$41,864	3.05	\$38,969
2	2,894,372	68,155	2,962,527	17.63	166,290	33.54	87,431
3	14,963		14,963	1.60	9,352	1.60	9,352
4	17,658,961	119,704	17,778,665	29.09	611,055	63.07	281,888
5	3,806,700	7,464	3,814,164	25.50	149,575	41.40	92,139
6	447,379	61,690	509,069	7.87	64,684	8.64	57,762
7	1,417,358	140,018	1,557,376	25.00	62,295	25.50	61,073
8	3,738,165	42,523	3,780,689	87.00	43,456	91.50	41,318
9	60,000		60,000	2.50	24,000	2.60	23,077
10	43,483		43,483	1.12	38,824	1.12	38,824
11	5,511,169	1,196,622	6,707,791	30.16	222,407	42.66	157,238
12	92,781	5,396	98,167	3.16	31,382	3.16	31,382
13	70,738,687	2,754,424	73,493,111	181.27	405,434	379.72	193,545
14	9,452,248	590,421	10,042,669	54.95	182,760	102.79	97,700
15	369,938	95	369,843	7.54	49,051	7.54	49,051
16		209,261	209,261	8.03	26,060	8.26	25,334
17	31,084,924	303,654	32,288,578	83.61	602,286	106.25	303,892
18	381,504	109,872	491,376	13.26	37,057	14.44	34,028

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		OPERATING INCOME.			
		Railway Operating Revenues.	Railway Operating Expenses.	Net Revenue, Railway Operations.	Net Revenue, Auxiliary Operations.
		1	2	3	4
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$14,020	\$17,479	\$3,459	
2 (a)	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co....				
3 (b)	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....				
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	2,783,538	1,533,329	1,250,209	
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	540,082	447,620	92,462	
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	124,435	99,449	24,986	
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	171,087	110,213	60,874	
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	335,063	223,751	111,312	(c) \$92,348
9	Kensington Railway Co.....	10,068	9,473	595	
10 (a)	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	2,015	2,260	245	
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	301,271	202,767	98,504	
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	6,863	11,316	4,453	
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	10,560,836	5,795,437	4,765,399	
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co..	1,560,125	738,597	821,528	(d) 25,575
15	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....		175	175	
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	20,341	24,181	3,840	
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	2,313,104	1,635,503	677,601	
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	68,661	76,943	8,282	

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		NON-OPERATING INCOME —Continued.			DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.
		Miscella- neous Income.	Total Non- Operating Income.	Gross Income.	Rent for Leased Roads.
		14	15	16	17
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....			\$3,772	
2	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co....				
3	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....				
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	\$4,435	\$16,262	1,080,188	
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....		312	60,762	
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....			20,405	
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	4,348	4,758	58,653	
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	12,381	21,848	225,709	
9	Kensington Railway Co.....			295	
10	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....			245	
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....		279,240	362,913	
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....		30	4,423	
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	25,172	96,100	3,781,777	\$431,835
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co..		12,893	730,944	
15	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....			436	
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....			4,858	
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	2,869	701,813	1,239,845	
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....		7,500	3,776	

(a) Road operated by The United Railways & Electric Co.
(b) Road operated by The Chambersburg, Greencastle & Waynesboro St. Railway Co.
(c) Net Income from Gas and Electric operations.
(d) Net Income from Power Contracts.
(e) Includes Taxes, \$11,500.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 21.

INCOME AND THE PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

OPERATING INCOME—Continued.			NON-OPERATING INCOME.					
Net Operating Revenue.	Taxes Assignable to Railway Operations.	Operating Income.	Miscellaneous Rent Income.	Dividend Income.	Income from Funded Securities.	Income from Unfunded Securities and Accounts.	Income from Reserve Funds.	Release of Premium on Funded Debt.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$3,459	\$313	\$3,772
1,250,209	186,283	1,063,926	\$3,855	\$7,780	\$191
92,462	32,011	60,451	312
24,986	4,581	20,405
60,874	6,979	53,895	\$410
203,860	203,860	224	\$6,539	2,554	\$150
595	300	295
245	245
98,504	14,830	83,674	279,095	144
4,453	4,453	30
4,765,399	1,079,723	3,685,676	1,122	4,950	\$3,787	11,069
847,103	129,052	718,051	1,290	5,166	6,437
175	261	436
3,840	1,018	4,858
677,601	142,569	535,032	660,000	8,000	33,826	118
8,282	2,994	11,276	7,500

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.						PROFIT AND LOSS.		
						CREDITS.		
Interest on Funded Debt.	Interest on Unfunded Debt.	Amortization of Discount on Funded Debt.	Miscellaneous Debits.	Total Deductions from Gross Income.	Net Income Transferred to Profit and Loss.	Credit Balance at Beginning of Year.	Balance Transferred from Income.	Donations.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
\$5,997	\$9,769
280,300	\$3,358	\$283,658	796,530	\$284,207	\$796,530
87,500	\$5,394	1,103	93,997	33,234	137,279
5,000	900	5,900	14,505	102,131	14,505
32,780	32,780	25,903	225,407	25,903
144,624	1,794	\$1,749	(e) 15,889	164,056	61,653	237,618	61,653
1,750	1,750	1,455
.....	3,929	3,929	4,174
314,588	40,999	2,458	358,045	4,867	4,867
.....	4,319	4,319	8,743
2,402,445	10,405	19,012	42,492	2,906,190	875,586	1,111,494	875,586
257,200	2,600	2,901	4,122	268,293	462,651	171,359	462,651
.....	1,323	1,323	1,760	297,753	1,760
7,500	280	7,780	12,638
706,894	6,570	9,328	9,074	731,866	507,979	1,071,923	507,979	\$7,665
9,250	3,973	7	15	13,246	17,021	1,899

TABLE No. 21

PROFIT AND LOSS—Continued.				
TITLE OF CORPORATION.	CREDITS—Continued.		DEBITS.	
	Miscella- neous Credits.	Total Credits.	Debit Balance at Beginning of Year.	Balance Transfers from Income.
	27	28	29	30
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....			\$15,182	\$9,769
2 Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co....				
3 Blue Ridge Railway Co.....				
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	\$201	\$1,080,938		
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....		137,279		33,234
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....		116,636		
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....		251,310		
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	165	299,436		
9 Kensington Railway Co.....			11,320	1,455
10 Loraine Electric Railway Co.....			33,278	4,174
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	116	4,983	613,245	
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....			23,385	8,743
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	1,941	1,989,021		
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co..	220	634,230		
15 Washington & Great Falls Railway & Power Co.....		299,513		
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....			4,230	12,638
17 Washington Railways & Electric Co.....	33,868	1,621,435		
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....		1,899		17,021

(J) Interest on \$1,225,000. 5% Adjustment Bonds, for 18 months.

—Continued.

PROFIT AND LOSS—Continued.

DEBITS—Continued.

Appropriations of Surplus to Sinking Funds and Other Reserves.	Dividend Appropriations From Surplus.	Surplus Invested in Physical Property.	Debt Discount Extinguished Through Surplus.	Miscellaneous Appropriations of Surplus.	Delayed Income Debits.	Miscellaneous Debits.	Total Debits.	Credit Balance Carried to Balance Sheet.	Debit Balance Carried to Balance Sheet.
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
.....	\$24,951	\$24,951
.....
.....	\$750,000	\$1,391	751,391	\$329,547
.....	33,234	104,045
.....	5,000	5,000	111,636
\$2,616	2,616	248,694
.....	25,275	(f) \$91,875	3,559	120,709	178,727
.....	12,775	12,775
.....	37,452	37,452
.....	\$2,860	\$51,894	7,653	675,672	670,668
.....	32,128	32,128
.....	819,368	14,398	88,267	922,033	1,066,988
.....	177,360	16	177,376	456,853
.....	299,513
.....	42	16,912	16,912
368	847,500	712	848,580	772,855
.....	17,021	15,122

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.	
		Revenue for Year Ended Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$14,020	\$300
2 (a)	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Railway Co.....		
3 (a)	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....		
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	2,783,538	494,287
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	540,082	63,128
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	124,436	17,151
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	174,283	23,152
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	335,064	19,188
9	Kensington Railway Co.....	10,068	348
10 (a)	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	2,015	52
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	301,271	44,378
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	6,863	1,040
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	10,560,837	646,785
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....	1,560,125	613,922
15 (b)	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....		
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	20,341	1,521
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	2,313,104	172,769
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	68,661	3,894

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		REVENUE FROM TRANSPORTATION—Continued.	
		Miscellaneous Transportation Revenue.	Total Revenue from Transportation.
		11	12
1	Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	\$200	\$14,020
2 (a)	Baltimore, Sparrow's Point and Chesapeake Railway Co.....		
3 (a)	Blue Ridge Railway Co.....		
4	Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....		2,767,150
5	City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....		532,384
6	Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....		118,636
7	Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....		171,087
8	Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	21	332,240
9	Kensington Railway Co.....		10,118
10 (a)	Loraine Electric Railway Co.....		
11	Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	960	295,685
12	Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....		6,844
13	United Railways & Electric Co.....	9,848	10,424,786
14	Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co.....		1,533,336
15 (b)	Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....		
16	Washington Interurban Railway Co.....		20,341
17	Washington Railway & Electric Co.....		1,944,534
18	Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....		66,768

(a) Road operated by another company.
(b) Inactive corporation.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 22.

OPERATING REVENUES FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE DISTRIBUTION THEREOF.

REVENUE FROM TRANSPORTATION.

Passenger Revenue.	Baggage Revenue.	Special Car Revenue.	Mail Revenue.	Express Revenue.	Milk Revenue.	Freight Revenue.	Switching Revenue.
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
\$13,820							
2,766,628		\$22	\$500				
531,943		378	63				
116,121			177			\$2,338	
157,477	\$1,817		204			11,589	
238,484	909	913	2,091	\$5,567	\$5,303	69,250	\$9,700
9,998						20	
2,015							
230,825	302	95	3,655	9,712		45,577	4,556
6,844							
10,362,136		20,653	32,148				
1,365,929	745		713	19,919	2,334	143,446	248
20,341							
1,924,021		1,116	658	520		4,098	14,122
65,345		68	55	1,300			

REVENUE FROM OTHER RAILWAY OPERATIONS.

Station and Car Privileges.	Parcel Room Receipts.	Demurrage.	Rent of Tracks and Facilities.	Rent of Equipment.	Rent of Buildings and Property.	Sale of Power.	Miscellaneous.	Total Revenue from Other Railway Operations.
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
\$11,904				\$555	\$358	\$3,571		\$16,388
2,600				4,174	924			7,698
300							\$5,500	5,800
726					410	1,999	60	3,195
842	\$32	\$1,069		843			38	2,823
50								50
248	552	2,808				1,961	17	5,586
18								18
54,953	169			741	1,577	77,293	1,316	136,051
3,168	4,020	1,448	\$10,396		5,858	754	1,144	26,788
9,620			5,896	34,904	13,326	304,724	100	368,570
390				1,503				1,893

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.		DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATING EXPENSES.	
	Operating Expenses, Year Ended December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Maintenance of Way and Structures.	Maintenance of Equipment.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co...	\$17,480	\$6,553	\$6,938	
2 (a) Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co.				
3 (a) Blue Ridge Railway Co.				
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington	1,533,329	295,918	199,479	\$154,647
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington...	447,619	39,187	47,915	48,096
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.	99,449	10,814	13,594	9,532
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Ry. Co.	110,212	18,401	16,113	8,493
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.	223,751	18,083	34,553	27,248
9 Kensington Railway Co.	9,473	*	2,314	1,142
10 (a) Loraine Electric Railway Co.	2,261	143		
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.	202,767	14,134	25,463	13,944
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.	11,316	308	775	3,220
13 United Railways & Electric Co.	5,795,437	731,784	(b)964,573	462,062
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis El. R. R. Co.	738,596	226,979	89,232	75,857
15 (c) Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.	175	9		162
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.	24,181	7,613	1,831	475
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.	1,635,502	133,431	175,008	226,080
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.	76,942	12,338	12,492	10,329

DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	WAY AND STRUCTURES—Continued.			EQUIPMENT.
	Maintenance of Buildings, Fixtures and Grounds.	Depreciation of Way and Structures.	Equalization, Way and Structures.	Superintendence.
	12	13	14	15
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co...	\$84			
2 (a) Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co.				
3 (a) Blue Ridge Railway Co.				
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington	6,911	\$115,632		\$5,619
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington...	2,605	25,911		1,478
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.	240	8,031		505
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Ry. Co.	127			600
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.	886		\$550	1,235
9 Kensington Railway Co.		1,130		200
10 (a) Loraine Electric Railway Co.				
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.	979			611
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.	45			
13 United Railways & Electric Co.	27,929	528,042		17,571
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis El. R. R. Co.	9,727			5,019
15 (c) Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.				
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.	16	81		41
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.	5,262	11,501		5,428
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.	422			222

(a) Road operated by another company.
(b) Includes depreciation on ways and structures and equipment, \$528,041.84.
(c) Inactive corporation.
Asterisk (*) denotes required figures not given in report.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 23.

OPERATING EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE DISTRIBUTION THEREOF.

Distribution of Operating Expenses—Continued.				DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES.		
				WAY AND STRUCTURES.		
Production of Power.	Conducting Transportation.	Traffic Expenses.	General Expenses.	Superintendence.	Maintenance of Way.	Maintenance of Electric Lines.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
\$3,044	\$4,875	\$2,622	\$6,678	\$176
.....
297,092	664,485	\$3,026	214,600	\$5,136	67,203	4,596
72,694	200,488	708	77,718	4,769	57,917	8,534
16,847	37,262	485	21,729	494	3,247	1,582
32,736	35,927	1,576	15,367	2,826	10,619	2,541
52,081	74,151	5,904	29,813	3,269	24,917	6,031
1,004	3,180	1,833	500	667	16
1,207	1,054
35,131	65,458	3,468	59,302	3,328	19,583	1,572
2,032	2,532	52	2,705	730
876,017	2,633,840	19,230	839,694	39,076	313,449	56,076
119,172	268,530	14,491	171,313	12,111	50,504	16,890
.....	13
5,372	10,137	6	6,360	91	809	833
271,285	747,440	1,445	214,243	15,093	134,601	31,553
14,484	29,304	283	10,051	862	9,994	1,214

DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued.

EQUIPMENT—Continued.

Maintenance of Cars.	Maintenance of Electrical Equipment of Cars.	Maintenance of Locomotives.	Miscellaneous Equipment Expenses.	Depreciation of Equipment.	Equipment Retired.	Equalization Equipment.
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
.....
.....
\$48,508	\$20,384	\$7,132	\$73,002
19,306	12,807	4,691	10,314
5,612	735	242	2,438
6,919	882	92
10,203	2,063	\$1,838	1,140	11,050	\$269	\$550
213	369	360
.....
5,934	1,727	1,353	776	3,542
101	119	3,000
255,498	133,066	55,947
19,564	25,885	6,083	19,306
.....	162
49	186	177	22
80,078	49,795	253	16,451	74,075
5,190	3,029	703	1,185

TABLE No. 23

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued.			
	POWER.			
	Superin- tendence.	Power Plant Buildings and Grounds.	Maintenance of Power Equipment.	Depreciation of Power Buildings and Equipment.
	23	24	25	26
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co...				
2 (a) Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co.				
3 (a) Blue Ridge Railway Co.....				
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	\$3,303	\$1,157	\$10,066	\$37,199
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington...	696	13	353	964
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....				
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Ry. Co.....	480		773	
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	3,054	128	2,502	6,950
9 Kensington Railway Co.....				
10 (a) Loraine Electric Railway Co.....				
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	6		1,004	
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....			9	
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	15,540	2,246	14,553	
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis El. R. R. Co.	721		21,838	
15 (c) Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....				
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....				
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	2,060	219	4,086	5,418
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	687	26	93	

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued.			
	CONDUCTING TRANSPORTA- TION—Cont.	TRAFFIC.	GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS.	
	Miscellaneous Transporta- tion Expenses.	Traffic Expenses.	General Expenses.	Valuation Expenses.
	34	35	36	37
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co...	\$101			
2 (a) Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co.				
3 (a) Blue Ridge Railway Co.....				
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	75,992	\$3,026	\$83,135	\$6,546
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington...	44,792	709	20,491	2,400
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	2,219	485	16,048	
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Ry. Co.....	5,201	1,576	9,138	
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	15,314	5,903	14,876	
9 Kensington Railway Co.....			806	
10 (a) Loraine Electric Railway Co.....				
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	34,491	3,468	23,152	
12 United Railways & Electric Co.....	515	52	2,221	
13 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis El. R. R. Co.	323,592	19,230	324,744	18,000
14 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	121,617	14,491	64,543	
15 (c) Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....			4	
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	989	6	461	90
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	167,251	1,445	84,375	8,790
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	8,542	282	3,394	360

(a) Road operated by another company.

(c) Inactive corporation.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

—Continued.

DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued.

POWER—Continued.					CONDUCTING TRANSPORTATION.	
Power Plant Employees.	Fuel for Power.	Other Power Supplies and Expenses.	Power Purchased.	Other Operations.	Superin- tendence.	Conductors, Motormen and Trainmen.
27	28	29	30	31	32	33
			\$3,044			\$4,774
\$28,794	\$206,694	\$9,878			\$61,349	527,144
5,437		178	65,052		17,792	137,903
			16,847		505	34,538
8,158	21,377	1,948			2,289	28,437
8,137	100,522	8,280	315	\$77,806	6,106	52,730
			1,004		500	2,680
			1,207			1,054
2,850			31,271		4,866	26,101
28			1,995		220	1,797
82,179	290,861	46,281	424,356		194,028	2,116,220
8,349		2,172	115,263	29,171	12,722	134,191
			5,372		339	8,809
18,583	220,232	20,686			84,473	495,716
2,069			11,608		3,495	17,266

DETAILS OF OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued.

GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS—Continued.						Ratio of Operating Expenses to Operating Revenue. Per Cent.
Injuries and Damages.	Insurance.	Stationery and Printing.	Store, Garage and Stable Expenses.	Rent of Tracks and Facilities.	Rent of Equipment.	
38	39	40	41	42	43	44
\$2,187					\$435	\$124.67
89,839	\$7,667	\$16,940	\$6,715	\$3,757		55.08
23,963	962	4,004	3,222		22,945	82.88
3,866	1,010	587	218			79.92
2,400	1,634	1,257	938			64.42
1,862	1,800	3,122	1,390		6,763	66.78
	6	21		1,000		94.09
						112.25
3,716	824	1,526	531	24,639	4,914	67.30
206	226	52				164.88
351,655	43,106	53,934	48,254			54.88
14,743	1,852	12,273	1,129	68,910	7,860	47.35
	9					*
915	4	163	122		4,604	118.88
87,477	5,959	16,292	11,349			70.71
3,004	94	527	483	143	2,046	112.06

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	ROAD OWNED—MILES.			
	Miles of Road.	Second Track.	All Other Main Track.	Sidings and Turnouts.
	1	2	3	4
1 (a) Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	2.84	0.21
2 (a) Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co..	17.63	14.81	1.09
3 (a) Blue Ridge Railway Co.....
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	30.15	27.08	1.81
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	26.26	15.18	0.88
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	7.87	0.50
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co....	25.00	0.50
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	87.00	2.00
9 Kensington Railway Co.....	2.50	0.10
10 (a) Loraine Electric Railway Co.....	1.12
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	26.60	12.50
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	3.16
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	181.27	177.81	6.12
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric R. R. Co.	54.95	37.27	8.94
15 (b) Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	8.03	0.23
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	53.62	44.03	3.57
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	13.25	0.50	0.68

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	EQUIPMENT, OWNED OR LEASED.				
	PASSENGER CARS.				
	Closed Passenger Cars.	Closed Passenger Cars with Electrical Equip-ment.	Open Passenger Cars.	Open Passenger Cars with Electrical Equip-ment.	Combina-tion Passenger Cars.
	14	15	16	17	18
1 (a) Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....
2 (a) Baltimore, Sparrow's Point & Chesapeake Ry. Co..	110	110
3 (a) Blue Ridge Railway Co.....
4 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	99	308	123	103
5 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	40
6 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	15	6	3
7 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Ry. Co.....	16
8 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	12	16
9 Kensington Railway Co.....	3
10 (a) Loraine Electric Railway Co.....
11 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	2	12
12 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	1
13 United Railways & Electric Co.....	110	299	418
14 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Elec. R. R. Co.	54	49
15 (b) Washington & Glen Echo Railroad Co.....
16 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	1
17 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	30	360	143	52
18 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	5

(a) Road operated by another company.
(b) Road not operated during the year.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC RAILROAD CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN MILEAGE, TRAFFIC AND REQUIRED

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	Passenger Car Mileage.	Freight, Mail and Express Car Mileage.	Total Car Mileage.	Passenger Car Hours.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	101,482	101,482	8,844
2 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	7,871,530	7,871,530	847,412
3 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	2,169,773	2,169,773	246,925
4 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	342,290	342,290	52,660
5 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co.....	468,101	34,272	502,373	43,637
6 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	*	*	*	*
7 Kensington Railway Co.....	85,356	85,356	6,710
8 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	707,452	58,241	765,693	24,739
9 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	41,851	41,851	3,311
10 United Railways & Electric Co.....	33,705,804	201,133	33,906,937	3,933,425
11 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Elec. R. R. Co. ...	2,396,355	245,305	2,641,660	*
12 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	153,475	153,475	15,161
13 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	7,463,192	25,886	7,489,078	913,840
14 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	380,573	11,299	391,872	29,957

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	Average Fare, Revenue Passengers.	Average Fare, All Passengers.	Total Revenue from Transportation.	Revenue from Transportation, per Car Mile.	Revenue from Transportation, per Car Hour.
	14	15	16	17	18
	Cents.	Cents.	Dollars.	Cents.	Dollars.
1 Baltimore, Halethorpe & Elkridge Railway Co.....	4.553	4.488	14,020	13.815	1.58
2 Capital Traction Co. of Washington.....	4.303	3.305	2,767,149	35.154	3.27
3 City & Suburban Railway Co. of Washington.....	4.226	3.357	532,383	24.536	2.15
4 Cumberland Electric Railway Co.....	4.272	*	118,635	34.659	2.25
5 Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co....	4.481	4.481	171,087	34.050	3.46
6 Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co.....	*	*	332,240	*	*
7 Kensington Railway Co.....	5.330	5.330	10,018	5.430	1.49
8 Maryland Electric Railways Co.....	24.806	24.806	295,684	38.617	10.05
9 Towson & Cockeysville Electric Railway Co.....	5.000	5.000	6,844	16.350	2.06
10 United Railways & Electric Co.....	4.867	3.497	10,424,786	30.745	2.62
11 Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric R. R. Co.	39.882	*	1,533,336	58.036	*
12 Washington Interurban Railway Co.....	4.454	3.337	20,341	13.254	1.34
13 Washington Railway & Electric Co.....	4.320	3.218	1,944,534	25.965	2.12
14 Washington & Rockville Railway Co.....	4.022	4.022	66,768	17.038	2.14

No. 25.

MISCELLANEOUS STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917. THE ASTERISK (*) DENOTES ABSENCE OF FIGURES.

Freight, Mail and Express Car Hours.	Total Car Hours.	Regular Fare Passengers Carried.	Revenue Transfer Passengers Carried.	Total Revenue Passengers Carried.	Free Transfer Passengers Carried.	Total Passengers Carried.	Employees and Others Carried Free.	Passenger Revenue.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	8,844	303,549		303,549	4,362	307,911	6,940	Dollars 13,820
	847,412	63,291,073	994,920	64,285,993	19,412,983	83,698,976	*	2,766,627
	246,925	12,496,558	89,700	12,586,258	3,260,237	15,846,495	81,911	531,943
	52,660	2,718,001		2,718,001	*	2,718,001	*	116,120
5,477	49,084	3,513,989		3,513,989		3,513,989	14,800	157,476
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	238,484
	6,710	187,553		187,553		187,553	*	9,998
4,692	29,431	930,528		930,528		930,528	77,763	230,825
	3,311	136,895		136,895		136,895	*	6,844
32,252	3,965,677	211,353,735	1,539,884	212,893,619	83,430,701	296,324,320	3,365,132	10,362,136
*	*	3,429,966		3,429,966		3,429,966	234,107	1,365,928
	15,161	456,675		456,675	152,931	609,606	1,968	20,341
1,988	915,828	44,386,391	148,658	44,535,049	15,260,546	59,795,595	368,981	1,924,020
1,205	31,162	1,624,780		1,624,780		1,624,780	20,102	65,345

Total Revenue from Other Railway Operations.	Revenue from Other Railway Operations, per Car Mile.	Revenue from Other Railway Operations, per Car Hour.	Total Operating Revenues.	Operating Revenues, per Car Mile.	Operating Revenues, per Car Hour.	Total Operating Expenses.	Operating Expenses, per Car Mile.	Operating Expenses, per Car Hour.
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
Dollars.	Cents.	Cents.	Dollars.	Cents.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Cents.	Dollars.
			14,020	13.815	1.58	17,480	17.224	1.97
16,388	00.208	1.934	2,783,538	35.362	3.28	1,533,329	19.479	1.81
7,698	00.355	3.118	540,082	24.891	2.18	447,619	20.630	1.81
5,800	01.694	11.014	124,435	36.353	2.36	99,450	29.054	1.88
3,195	00.636	6.510	174,282	34.692	3.55	110,212	21.938	2.24
2,833	*	*	335,063	*	*	223,751	*	*
50	*	*	10,068	5.378	1.50	9,472	11.090	1.41
5,586	00.730	18.982	301,271	39.346	10.24	202,767	26.482	6.89
18	00.043	00.543	6,862	16.410	2.06	11,316	24.65	3.41
136,050	00.402	3.431	10,560,836	31.147	2.66	5,795,437	17.092	1.46
26,788	01.014	*	1,560,125	59.050	*	738,596	27.955	*
			20,341	13.254	1.34	24,181	15.756	1.59
368,570	04.921	4.024	2,313,104	30.886	2.52	1,635,502	21.839	1.78
1,893	00.483	6.075	68,661	17.521	2.20	76,942	19.635	2.46

TABLE No. 26.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNTS OF ASSETS, OF LIABILITIES AND OF SURPLUS, ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF GROSS INCOME, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE INCREASES OR DECREASES FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	Totals.											
	Assets.			Liabilities.			Surplus or Deficit.			Gross Income.		
	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Net Income.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Antietam Electric Light Co.	\$40,887	\$7,139	\$34,425	\$6,441	\$6,462	\$898	\$8,093	*	\$0,849	*	\$1,244	*
2 (a) Baltimore County Electric Co.	371,000	272,721	7,706,370	272,721	6,719	2,328	10,974	*	13,302	*	2,328	*
3 (a) Baltimore Elec. Co. of Baltimore City ..	7,713,069	825	45,725	1,500	872	745	8,473	*	7,089	*	1,383	*
4 Chestertown Electric L. & P. Co.	46,597	1,103	91,889	358	781	924	3,604	*	4,528	*	924	*
5	91,098	1,624	81,898	700	21,130	10,398	25,862	*	26,980	*	1,118	*
6	60,768	5,622	61,549	16,021	3,226	1,556	235,791	*	190,103	*	39,088	*
7	58,323	33,006	947,905	31,450	54,616	607	4,820	*	3,308	*	1,461	*
8	1,002,521	800	9,315	183	3,435	*	9,693	*	6,120	*	3,563	*
9	12,750	*	68,365	*	13,944	3,082	16,215	\$5,591	14,766	\$6,540	1,429	949
10 (b)	82,326	4,391	41,376	7,473	389	167	24,527	*	24,694	*	167	*
11	41,765	23,057	100,803	23,224	3,150	3,548	14,243	*	9,532	*	4,711	*
12	103,953	5,199	55,605	1,651	5,279	2,438	13,490	1,956	10,445	724	3,035	2,680
13	60,884	4,393	65,358	1,957	2,801	2,402	20,178	3,781	19,918	4,675	260	694
14	62,557	19,320	52,931	16,918	445	20	5,321	591	4,491	334	830	257
15	53,376	29	5,000	5,917	*	3,798	*	4,115	*	316	*
16 (b)	10,917	*	16,262	837
17 (b)	16,589	24,829	89,443	24,829	199,551	107,351	11,630	94,691	22,133	12,600	10,308
18 (a)	288,994	11,698	102,929	6,506	166,623	5,192	107,351
19	271,552	225,000
20 (a)	200,000	200,000
21 (a)	119,026	1,993	86,254	2,629	32,772	438	23,422	*	21,108	*	2,314	*
22	20,186	76	22,858	317	2,872	392	2,953	*	2,561	*	392	*
23	16,919,980	1,172,744	16,636,912	1,185,649	263,068	12,906	2,639,587	207,113	1,832,639	298,968	1,056,948	91,868
24	336,420	27,102	211,861	23,024	25,696	4,078	57,934	13,186	48,482	15,401	9,452	2,218
25 (a)	237,557	240	14,585	252	1,980	12	6,068	213	6,110	1,832	12	1,619
26	16,545	*	22,262	*	237	*	1,357	*	1,594	*	237	*
27 (b)	22,025	133,011	1,821,446	133,011	2,689	46,697	*	46,697	*	*
28	1,821,446	26,453	8,175	*	5,486	*	2,689	*
29	32,171
30

(a) Operated by Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore

(b) First complete report.

* Denotes required figures not given.

Note—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF ASSETS, THE TOTAL

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.			
		Assets.		Liabilities.	
		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2	3	4
1	Antietam Electric Light & Power Co.....	\$40,887	\$7,139	\$34,425	\$6,441
2(a)	Baltimore County Electric Co.....	371,000		371,000	
3(a)	Baltimore Elec. Co. of Baltimore City.....	7,713,089	272,721	7,706,370	272,721
4	Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.....	46,597	828	45,725	1,500
5	Delmarvia Utilities Co.....	91,098	1,103	91,889	358
6	Delta Electric Power Co.....	60,768	1,624	81,898	700
7	Easton Utilities Commission.....	58,323	5,622	61,549	16,021
8	Edison Electric Illuminating Co.....	1,002,521	33,006	947,905	31,450
9	Emmitsburg Electric Co.....	12,750	800	9,315	133
10(b)	Electric & Ice Mfg. Co.....	82,329	*	68,385	*
11	Harpers Ferry Electric Light & Power Co.....	41,765	4,391	41,376	7,473
12	Havre de Grace Electric Co.....	103,953	23,057	100,803	23,224
13	Home Electric Co.....	60,884	5,199	55,605	1,651
14	Home Manufacturing Light & Power Co.....	62,557	4,393	66,358	1,957
15	Idlewild Electric Light, Heat & Power Co.....	53,376	19,320	52,931	16,918
16	Midland Electric Light Co.....	10,917	20	5,000	
17(b)	Mt. Airy Ice & Electric Co.....	16,589	*	16,252	*
18(a)	Mt. Washington Electric Light & Power Co.....	288,994	24,829	89,443	24,829
19	Municipal Electric Light Plant of Hagerstown.....	271,552	11,698	102,929	6,506
20(a)	Patapsco Electric & Manufacturing Co. of Delaware....	225,000		225,000	
21(a)	Patapsco Electric & Manufacturing Co. of Maryland....	200,000		200,000	
22	Peninsular Light & Power Co.....	119,026	1,993	86,254	2,629
23	Perryville Electric Co.....	20,186	75	22,858	317
24	Potomac Electric Power Co.....	16,919,980	1,172,744	16,656,912	1,185,649
25(a)	Roland Park Electric & Water Co.....	336,420		336,067	
26	Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co.....	237,557	27,102	211,861	23,024
27	Snow Hill Electric Light & Power Co.....	16,545	240	14,565	252
28(b)	St. Michaels Utilities Commission.....	22,025	*	22,062	*
29	Susquehanna Transmission Co. of Maryland.....	1,821,446	133,011	1,821,446	133,011
30	Union Bridge Electric Manufacturing Co.....	32,171		29,482	

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF ASSETS —Continued.		DETAILS OF LIABILITIES	
		Unex-tinguished Discount on Securities.	Sundries.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.
		14	15	16	17
1	Antietam Electric Light & Power Co.....			\$11,500	\$14,000
2(a)	Baltimore County Electric Co.....	\$16,486		150,000	221,000
3(a)	Baltimore Electric Co. of Baltimore City.....	8,750		3,500,000	3,721,000
4	Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.....	1,917		15,000	21,300
5	Delmarvia Utilities Co.....			76,000	10,000
6	Delta Electric Co.....			29,500	22,500
7	Easton Utilities Commission.....				30,000
8	Edison Electric Illuminating Co.....	42,723	\$1,331	275,000	490,000
9	Emmitsburg Electric Co.....			7,500	
10(b)	Electric & Ice Manufacturing Co.....			26,900	14,500
11	Harpers Ferry Electric Light & Power Co.....			29,900	
12	Havre de Grace Electric Co.....			50,000	
13	Home Electric Light Co.....	35		13,825	18,200
14	Home Manufacturing Light & Power Co.....	5,880	5,642	8,600	43,400
15	Idlewild Electric Light, Heat & Power Co.....	3,185	237	17,000	33,000
16	Midland Electric Light Co.....			5,000	
17(b)	Mt. Airy Ice & Electric Co.....			11,548	
18(a)	Mt. Washington Electric Light & Power Co.....			83,260	
19	Municipal Electric Light Plant of Hagerstown.....				46,000
20(a)	Patapsco Electric & Manufacturing Co. of Delaware....			225,000	
21(a)	Patapsco Electric & Manufacturing Co. of Maryland....			200,000	
22	Peninsular Light & Power Co.....			75,000	
23	Perryville Electric Co.....		466	20,755	
24	Potomac Electric Power Co.....	199,300	37,604	6,000,000	7,750,000
25(a)	Roland Park Electric & Water Co.....	25,000		25,000	300,000
26	Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co.....		271	100,000	47,000
27	Snow Hill Electric Light & Power Co.....			12,000	
28(b)	St. Michaels Utilities Commission.....				
29	Susquehanna Transmission Co. of Maryland.....	164,300		500	1,643,000
30	Union Bridge Electric Manufacturing Co.....			15,000	

(a) Operated by Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore.

(b) First complete report.

Asterick * denotes required figures not given.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 27.

AMOUNT OF LIABILITIES AND THE SURPLUS ON DEC. 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.

TOTALS—Cont.		DETAILS OF ASSETS.						
Surplus or Deficit.								
Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Cost of Plant.	Cash.	Bills and Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Invest- ments.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Special Deposits and Pre- payments.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$6,462	\$698	\$40,547	\$94	\$75	\$170			
		303,756		50,757				
6,719		5,959,654		304,315		\$1,155,000	\$285,371	
872	2,328	41,937	2,743					
791	745	90,218	70	575	235			
21,130	924	60,493	20	29	225			
3,226	10,399	45,169	1,560	10,244	1,350			
54,616	1,556	872,268	2,568	59,064	16,847	7,720		
3,435	667	10,900	1,295	518	36			
13,944	*	63,158	915	11,552	1,089	4,952		\$664
389	3,082	40,678	389	697				
3,150	167	91,592	5,687	4,714	1,960			
5,279	3,548	52,672	837	6,035	1,304			
2,801	2,436	47,059	1,270	2,513	182	10		
445	2,402	39,606	623	9,562				164
5,917	20	9,030	450	1,425	12			
337	*	16,000	395	62	132			
199,551		269,798		19,196				
168,623	5,192	245,733	8,540	15,280	1,903			95
		213,180		11,820				
		179,746		20,254				
32,772	636	101,686	580	6,080		10,126		554
2,672	392	19,190	153	377				
263,068	12,906	12,973,720	256,985	830,023	268,822	1,138,877	978,744	235,902
353		311,420						
25,696	4,078	213,185	3,916	19,645				538
1,980	12	14,289	241	1,915	100			
237	*	18,757	689	1,221	1,359			
		1,657,146						
2,689		32,172	92	799	155			

DETAILS OF LIABILITIES—Continued.

Taxes Accrued and Unpaid.	Interest Accrued on Funded Debt.	Interest Accrued on Unfunded Debt.	Bills and Accounts Payable.	Dividends Payable.	Consumers' Deposits.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Reserves for Amortisa- tions and Deprecia- tion.	Sundries.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
			\$1,355				\$7,569	
			200,000			\$285,371		
	\$375		9,050					
\$156		\$420	5,104	\$210				
		50	29,848					
	750		26,466				4,392	
	6,125		43,000		\$2,911	11,675	109,193	\$10,000
			1,815					
	435	11	14,863				11,676	
			11,476					
			50,742		60			
		1,200	21,179				1,200	
136			7,580					5,642
382	174		1,766			490	118	
		252	4,200					
							6,184	
							56,929	
444			3,467			286	7,056	
			2,103					
136,884	7,083	10,849	356,690		106,060	1,172,735	1,106,962	
			11,067					
396	195		38,115		147	4,619	1,388	20,000
			2,565					
			22,262					
			177,946					
		68	14,137					277

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE GROSS INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES, FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE

		TOTALS.			
TITLE OF CORPORATION		Gross Income from all Sources.	Deductions from Gross Income.	Net Income.	Appropriations from Net Income.
		1	2	3	4
1	Antietam Electric Light & Power Co.....	\$8,093	\$6,849	\$1,244	\$546
2	Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.....	10,974	13,302	2,328
3	Delmarvia Utilities Co.....	8,473	7,089	1,383	2,128
4	Delta Electric Power Co.....	3,604	4,528	924
5	Easton Utilities Commission.....	25,862	26,980	1,118	9,282
6	Edison Electric Illuminating Co.....	235,791	196,103	39,688	38,131
7	Emmitsburg Electric Co.....	4,829	3,368	1,461	794
8 (b)	Electric & Ice Mfg. Co.....	9,683	6,120	3,563	1,000
9	Harper's Ferry Elec. Lt. & Power Co.....	16,215	14,786	1,429	4,510
10	Havre de Grace Electric Co.....	24,527	24,694	167
11	Home Electric Light Co.....	14,243	9,532	4,711	1,163
12	Home Manufacturing Lt. & Power Co.....	13,480	10,445	3,035	599
13	Idlewild Elec. Light Heat & Power Co.....	20,178	19,918	260	2,662
14	Midland Electric Light Co.....	5,321	4,491	830	850
15 (b)	Mt. Airy Ice & Electric Co.....	3,798	4,115	316
16	Municipal Elec. Lt. Plant of Hagerstown.....	107,351	94,691	12,660	7,467
17	Peninsular Light & Power Co.....	23,422	21,108	2,314	2,950
18	Perryville Electric Co.....	2,953	2,561	392
19	Potomac Electric Power Co.....	2,639,587	1,582,639	1,056,948	1,069,854
20	Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co.....	57,934	48,481	9,452	5,373
21	Snow Hill Electric Light & Power Co.....	6,098	6,110	12
22 (b)	St. Michaels Utilities Commission.....	1,357	1,594	237
23	Susquehanna Transmission Co. of Md.....	46,697	46,697
24	Union Bridge Electric Mfg. Co.....	8,175	5,486	2,689

		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.			
TITLE OF CORPORATION.		OPERATING EXPENSES —Continued.		OTHER DEDUCTIONS.	
		Commercial and New Business.	General.	Taxes.	Uncollectible Bills.
		11	12	13	14
1	Antietam Electric Light & Power Co.....	\$683	\$189
2	Chestertown Electric Light & Power Co.....	\$20	4,108	224
3	Delmarvia Utilities Co.....	188	202
4	Delta Electric Power Co.....	85	121
5	Easton Utilities Commission.....	3,053
6	Edison Electric Illuminating Co.....	7,820	27,321	14,045
7	Emmitsburg Electric Co.....	1,258	270
8 (b)	Electric & Ice Mfg. Co.....	7	1,026	232	\$525
9	Harpers Ferry Electric Light & Power Co.....	2,180	393	216
10	Havre de Grace Electric Co.....	3,369	944	14
11	Home Electric Light Co.....	67	1,402	219
12	Home Manufacturing Light & Power Co.....	68	1,685	244	522
13	Idlewild Elec. Lt., Heat & Power Co.....	2,514	3,878	461	119
14	Midland Electric Light Co.....	357	175	322
15	Municipal Electric Lt. Plant of Hagerstown.....	6,141	453
16	Peninsular Light & Power Co.....	1,522	3,350	1,569	122
17	Perryville Electric Co.....	387	153
18	Potomac Electric Power Co.....	108,315	407,534	190,430	12,961
19	Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co.....	4,134	12,951	2,760	320
20	Snow Hill Electric Light & Power Co.....	335	230
21 (b)	St. Michaels Utilities Commission.....	209
22	Susquehanna Transmission Co. of Md.....
23	Union Bridge Electric Mfg. Co.....	303	280
24 (b)	Mt. Airy Ice & Electric Co.....	154	33

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.
(b) First annual report.

No. 28.

THIS DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME, THE NET INCOME, THE APPROPRIATIONS FROM NET INCOME AND THE SURPLUS YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

TOTALS—Cont.	DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.		
			OPERATING EXPENSES.		
			Production.	Distribution.	Utilization.
Surplus or Deficit.	Operating Revenue.	Non-Operating Revenue.			
5	6	7	8	9	10
\$698	\$8,043	\$50	\$2,584	\$1,542	\$132
2,328	10,972	2	5,197	688	285
745	8,473		5,399	989	
924	3,604		2,509	78	
10,400	25,844	18	21,451	811	
1,557	235,471	320	94,662	14,147	11,231
667	4,829		1,442	226	82
2,563	5,885	3,798	3,453	35	
3,081	16,215		2,696	6,860	2,124
167	24,527		16,605	926	172
3,548	14,198	45	4,566	1,568	79
2,436	13,480		6,047	1,344	98
2,402	19,851	327	9,391	1,084	306
20	5,321		2,700	937	
316	3,798		3,781		42
5,193	107,351		55,102	12,965	198
636	23,360	62	13,108	1,224	204
392	2,953		2,020		
12,906	2,612,970	26,617	313,929	220,926	56,170
4,079	57,934		21,616	2,436	1,222
12	6,098		5,392	47	11
237	1,357		933		
	46,697			46,697	
2,689	4,020	4,155	3,620	482	

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.

OTHER DEDUCTIONS—Continued.			APPROPRIATIONS FROM INCOME.			
Interest on Funded Debt.	Interest on Unfunded Debt.	Miscellaneous.	Amortisations and Depreciation of Plant.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Dividends Declared.	Sundries.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
\$854		\$865				\$546
1,278		1,501				2,128
300	\$12					
50	1,625	60				7,014
1,500		164	\$2,268		\$12,375	4
24,562	1,300	1,013	20,848	\$4,912	582	212
	90					
435	265	140	1,000			3,645
	315		865			
	2,691					37
468	1,114	47	1,200			
	436		599			2,662
2,082		82			850	
1,860		17,972	7,467		3,000	50
	8					
371,454	9,234		302,696	106,000	660,000	1,158
2,364	576	100		1,500	3,500	373
	94					
	305	146				
	800					
105						

TABLE No. 30.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS OPERATING STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.
THE CHARACTERS SHOWN IN THIS TABLE INDICATE AS FOLLOWS: 0—NONE; *—ABSENCE OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	STATIONS.										PLANT.				
	Number and Capacity.					Made and Sold.									
	Generating Stations.	Capacity in K. W.	Sub-Stations.	Capacity in K. W.	Total Station Out-put.	1000 K. W. Hours.		Number of Boilers.	Rated Horse Power.	Number of Engines.	Rated Horse Power.	Number of Water Wheels.	Rated Horse Power.	Number of Generators.	Total K. W.
						Total Sold.	Pr. Ct. Un- accounted For.								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	150	0	0	*	*	*	1	125	1	125	0	2	300	2	150
2	6,000	1	4,200	*	*	*	8	400	3	8,040	0	0	0	3	6,000
3	55,500	11	40,300	339	697	306,505	9.77	23,908	8	74,085	0	0	0	8	55,500
4	350	0	0	*	*	116	*	350	2	850	0	0	0	1	350
5	200	0	0	0	0	0	2	285	2	270	0	0	0	2	200
6	110	0	0	111	*	*	2	180	2	1424	0	0	0	2	110
7	262	0	0	81	60	25.92	3	325	3	320	0	0	0	3	195
8	350	0	0	*	85	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	350
9	250	0	0	185	*	*	2	300	2	350	0	0	0	1	250
10	4,000	1	3,000	11,091	8,207	26.00	11	3,892	4	5,966	0	0	0	4	4,000
11 (e)	0	0	0	55	46	16.38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	225	0	0	*	*	*	2	300	2	200	0	0	0	2	225
13	2,200	8	1,950	14,593	13,327	8.57	3	2,100	2	3,200	0	0	0	2	2,200
14 (a)	200	0	0	410	339	17.56	4	550	0	0	0	0	0	1	200
15	285	0	0	304	207	21.90	0	0	3	458	0	0	0	3	285
16 (c)	0	0	0	242	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 (c)	0	0	0	385	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 (c)	0	0	0	4,582	*	*	6	1,800	3	3,250	0	0	0	3	0
19	2,330	1	0	*	*	*	2	1,800	1	57	0	0	0	1	2,330
20	33	0	0	512	360	29.68	3	150	1	470	0	0	160	4	33
21	427	0	0	38	29	23.68	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	427
22 (e)	0	0	0	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23 (b)	0	3	1,700	1,054	1,300	20.30	2	710	3	750	0	0	200	3	0
24	675	0	0	*	*	*	2	125	2	215	0	0	0	4	675
25	120	0	0	*	*	*	1	0	1	75	0	0	0	1	120
26	75	0	0	*	*	*	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	75

(a) Generating plant in West Virginia.
(b) Generating plant in District of Columbia.
(c) Purchases current.

TABLE No. 31.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS OPERATING STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.
THE CHARACTERS SHOWN IN THIS TABLE INDICATE AS FOLLOWS: 0—NONE; *—ABSENCE OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	On What Schedule.	STREET LIGHTING.						COMMERCIAL LIGHTING.			
		Arc Lamps.			Incandescent Lamps.			Number of Consumers.	Number of Meters in Service.	Number of Transformers in Service.	
		Number of Enclosed.	Watts at Lamp.	Price Per Lamp Per Year.	Number of Lamps.	Candle Power.	Price Per Lamp Per Year.				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1	All Night	0	0	0	110	60	\$13.50-23.33	323	245	63	
2	Various	4,404	320-523	\$62-86.00	6,100	16-400	6.00-76.00	52,712	54,443	5,192	
3	Moonlight	49	320	60.00	31	40	18.00	294	284	37	
4	Dark to Dawn	0	0	0	113	50-400	18.00-36.00	*	157	24	
5	Moonlight	0	0	0	101	32	18.00	222	215	34	
6	Moonlight	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	191	16	
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	23	20	
8	Dusk to Dawn	0	0	0	123	80-250	18.00-30.00	*	419	39	
9	Dusk to Dawn	34	495-500	35.90	622	60-600	3.95-26.85	*	3,938	206	
10	Moonlight	0	0	0	38	40	12.00	148	150	7	
11	All Night	0	0	0	157	20	10.00	290	258	24	
12	All Night	0	0	0	344	50-600	10.00-63.60	3,292	3,152	456	
13	All Night	0	0	0	85	100	9.00	543	543	50	
14	All Night	6	750	70.00	118	40-100	17.50-32.50	422	422	*	
15	Dusk to Dawn	0	0	0	86	*	12.00	683	683	*	
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227	201	37	
17	Sunset to Sunrise	0	0	0	163	*	12.00-16.00	557	557	48	
18	Dusk to Dawn	0	0	0	37	32-250	10.00-13.20	350	0	13	
19	All Night	209	600	50.00	307	32-400	18.00-41.50	3,574	8,659	326	
20	Sunset to Sunrise	0	0	0	55	60	15.00-18.00	98	86	7	
21	All Night	0	0	0	*	*	*	*	457	50	
22	All Night	0	0	0	15	32	18.00	101	101	11	
23	All Night	0	0	0	746	20-60	12.00-18.11	3,307	3,356	790	
24	Dusk to 1.30 A. M.	0	0	0	*	40-250	12.00-39.50	1,125	950	71	
25	Sunset to Sunrise	0	0	0	59	80-280	*	*	96	8	
26	All Night	0	0	0	67	16	13.00	109	132	78	
27	Moonlight	0	0	0	20	100	26.50	100	140	17	

TABLE No. 33.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT AND GAS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF ASSETS, OF LIABILITIES AND OF SURPLUS, ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF GROSS INCOME, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM THE GROSS INCOME AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE INCREASES OR DECREASES FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.											
	ASSETS.			GROSS INCOME.				DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.		NET INCOME.		
	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	In-crease Over Pre-ceeding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	In-crease Over Pre-ceeding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	In-crease Over Pre-ceeding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	
												1
1	\$471,066	\$17,060	\$488,126	\$17,912	\$1,135	\$652	\$96,273	\$7,185	\$86,010	\$12,125	\$10,263	\$4,949
2	346,123	22,781	368,904	22,036	18,692	746	70,712	20,955	69,534	24,702	1,178	3,767
3	188,900	11,984	200,884	6,424	6,570	6,570	40,436	*	35,528	*	7,908	*
4	60,444,605	9,268	69,713,873	5,276	1,965,950	3,992	9,249,089	1,379,921	7,098,708	1,458,458	2,150,381	78,837
5	11,319,263	9,964	11,329,227	27,857	328	17,893	27,590	*	19,940	*	7,650	*
6	133,158	78,190	211,348	75,862	328	954	6,161	2,423	7,207	967	954	2,810
7	26,135	*	26,135	*	*	954	6,161	*	5,448	*	708	*
8	104,799	*	107,275	*	2,476	1,803	24,982	*	26,785	*	1,803	*
9	595,186	10,317	605,503	3,120	37,020	7,197	90,630	12,633	79,653	14,913	10,977	2,298
10	118,766	1,077	119,843	3,202	19,746	2,125	10,595	1,866	12,720	1,449	2,128	437
11	214,861	9,417	224,278	13,107	43,322	3,890	51,386	7,651	44,840	11,562	6,746	3,811
12	6,508	*	6,508	178	178	892	892	*	852	*	40	*
13	24,308	6,345	30,653	5,702	3,598	643	12,142	*	10,899	*	1,243	*
14	204,982	2,489	207,471	9,613	16,967	7,124	30,178	4,574	28,219	5,951	1,959	10,825
15	249,645	3,172	252,817	23,899	19,686	29,727	55,337	36,673	76,064	16,754	29,727	53,427
16	3,770,410	240,721	3,856,150	337,940	96,740	97,219	331,721	145,944	360,454	14,921	28,733	160,866
17												

†Natural Gas Companies.

*Denotes absence of required figures.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items in this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT AND GAS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SUCH ASSETS

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.			
		ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2	3	4
1	Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....	\$471,068	\$17,060	\$469,033	\$17,013
2	Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.....	346,123	22,781	327,431	22,685
3	Citizens Gas Co.....	188,900	11,994	188,900	6,484
4	Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....	60,444,605	9,268	58,478,655	5,276
5	Consolidated Power Co.....	11,319,263		11,319,263	
6	Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....	133,158	9,964	133,158	27,857
7	Do.....	76,190	371	75,862	900
8	Do.....	26,135	*	26,135	*
9	Co. of Montgomery Co.....	104,799	*	107,275	*
10	& Co.....	595,186	10,317	558,111	2,126
11	Do.....	113,796	1,077	133,542	3,302
12	Do.....	214,861	9,417	171,539	13,107
13	Heating Co.....	6,503	*	6,330	*
14	Co. of Montgomery Co.....	24,308	6,345	20,710	5,702
15	Do.....	204,992	2,489	188,035	9,413
16	Gas Co. of Maryland.....	249,645	3,172	229,959	23,599
17	Gas Co. of West Virginia.....	3,770,410	240,721	3,866,180	337,900

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF ASSETS—Continued.			DETAILS OF LIABILITIES
		Unex-tinguished Discount on Securities.	Rescquired Securities.	Sundries.	Capital Stock.
		14	15	16	17
1	Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....		\$35	\$149	\$172,700
2	Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.....	\$3,920			100,000
3	Citizens Gas Co.....				65,000
4	Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....	1,016,523		1,392,171	14,355,899
5	Consolidated Power Co.....	279,190		6,000,000	100
6	Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....				35,540
7	Crisfield Light & Power Co.....				40,000
8	Elkton Gas Light Co.....				18,580
9	Georgetown Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....				10,000
10	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.....	34,053		34,000	200,000
11	Havre de Grace Gas Co.....				50,000
12	Hyattsville Gas & Electric Co.....				86,000
13	Manchester Lighting & Heating Co.....				5,390
14	Washington Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....				10,000
15	†Northern Natural Gas Co.....				100,000
16	†West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of Maryland.....				20,000
17	†West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of West Virginia.....			162,735	2,000,000

† Natural Gas Companies.

Asterisk (*) denotes required figures not given.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items in this table are printed in bold type.

No. 34.

OF ASSETS, THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF LIABILITIES AND THE SURPLUS ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION AND LIABILITIES.

TOTALS—Continued.		DETAILS OF ASSETS.						
SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.								
Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Cost of Plant.	Cash.	Bills and Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Invest- ments.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Special Deposits and Pre- payments.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11 .	12	13
\$1,135	\$852	\$402,330	\$9,257	\$23,771	\$4,087	\$27,771	\$3,965
18,692	746	318,360	1,610	21,919	314
.....	5,570	174,655	1,691	7,358	5,194
1,965,950	3,992	47,242,230	1,626,372	3,856,133	1,427,441	\$2,680,524	649,415	553,095
.....	1,588,162	100	450,000	3,001,811
.....	17,893	116,388	2,108	7,098	7,463	100
328	954	70,622	27	2,348	3,192
.....	25,105	109	615
2,476	*	102,200	285	2,283	30
37,020	7,197	483,859	23,025	7,649	12,345	254
19,746	2,125	110,775	18	466	2,272	264
43,322	3,690	191,523	1,041	14,110	7,622	563
178	*	5,380	128	50	950
3,598	643	20,383	2,215	1,710
16,957	7,124	199,082	1,610	4,300
19,686	20,727	248,339	1,306
96,746	97,219	3,212,548	60,009	105,060	56	230,000

DETAILS OF LIABILITIES—Continued.

Funded Debt.	Taxes Accrued and Unpaid.	Interest Accrued on Funded and Other Debt.	Bills and Accounts Payable.	Dividends Payable.	Consumers' Deposits.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Reserve for Depre- ciation and Amortisa- tion.	Sundries.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
\$198,500	\$1,182	\$3,864	\$28,509	\$3,197	\$53,346	\$8,635
161,000	472	806	55,967	91	1,084	8,012
120,000	810	3,090
37,805,990	829,684	3,399,260	\$288,122	29,992	703,425	1,036,380
11,000,000	319,163
50,000	875	15,595	40	31,107
30,000	900	4,962
6,000	1,555
.....	93,844	3,432
325,000	909	6,084	4,314	8,818	1,697	11,331	\$12
50,000	7,696	25,846
.....	731	118	83,424	1,945	678
.....	950
.....	10,190	520
.....	16,670	219	34,318	36,828
.....	22,962	2,145	73,051	111,801
150,000	2,250	862,192	21,329	11,340	818,318

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT AND GAS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE AMOUNT OF GROSS NET INCOME AND THE SURPLUS FROM THE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.			
	Gross Income from all Sources.	Deductions from Gross Income.	Net Income.	Appropriations from Net Income.
	1	2	3	4
1 Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....	\$96,273	\$86,010	\$10,263	\$11,115
2 Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.....	70,712	69,534	1,178	432
3 Citizens Gas Co.....	40,436	35,528	7,908	13,478
4 Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....	9,249,089	7,098,708	2,150,381	2,146,389
5 Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....	27,590	19,940	7,650	25,543
6 Crisfield Light & Power Co.....	8,161	7,207	954
7 Elkton Gas Light Co.....	6,156	5,448	708
8 Georgetown Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	24,982	26,785	1,803
9(a) Hagerstown & Frederick Ry. Co. (Electric and Gas Depts.)	269,647	152,541	117,106	*
10 Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.....	90,630	79,653	10,977	3,780
11 Havre de Grace Gas Co.....	10,595	12,720	2,125
12 Hyattsville Gas & Electric Co.....	51,386	44,640	6,746	10,436
13 Manchester Lighting & Heating Co.....	892	852	40
14 Washington Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	12,142	10,899	1,243	600
15 †Northern Natural Gas Co.....	30,178	28,219	1,959	9,000
16 †West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of Maryland.....	55,337	76,064	20,727
17 †West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of West Virginia.....	331,721	360,454	28,733	65,009

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.			
	OPERATING EXPENSES, GAS—Cont.			OTHER DEDUCTIONS
	Transmission and Distribution.	Commercial.	General.	Taxes.
	14	15	16	17
1 Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....	\$833	\$2,007	\$2,336	\$4,487
2 Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.....	1,132	1,015	2,713	2,681
3 Citizens Gas Co.....	1,413	255	5,969	2,504
4 Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....	242,885	252,344	251,468	717,170
5 Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....	266	1,003	386
6 Crisfield Light & Power Co.....	361	464	882	26
7 Elkton Gas Light Co.....	309	352	15	48
8 Georgetown Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	4,457	1,512	3,023	730
9(a) Hagerstown & Frederick Ry. Co. (Electric and Gas Depts.)	2,083	1,343	3,885
10 Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.....	6,294	7,413	9,706	4,580
11 Havre de Grace Gas Co.....	697	617	918	792
12 Hyattsville Gas & Electric Co.....	2,000	4,226	4,074	3,151
13 Manchester Lighting & Heating Co.....	39
14 Washington Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	235	443	1,090	434
15 †Northern Natural Gas Co.....	5,586	2,825	2,518
16 †West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of Maryland.....	19,985	11,355	3,454
17 †West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of West Virginia.....	97,700	41,011	19,707

(a) See Electric Railway Table No. 21.
† Natural Gas Companies.
Asterisk (*) denotes required figures not given.
NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items in this table are printed in bold type.

No. 35.

INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME, THE NET INCOME, THE APPROPRIATIONS FROM OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

TOTALS —Continued.	DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME.			DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.				
				OPERATING EXPENSES, ELECTRIC.				OPERATING EXPENSES, GAS.
	Surplus or Deficit.	Operating Revenue, Electric.	Operating Revenue, Gas.	Non- Operating Revenue.	Production.	Transmis- sion and Distribu- tion.	Utilisation and Commercial.	General.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$852	\$49,800	\$46,473	\$27,000	\$1,538	\$2,355	\$2,371	\$32,402
746	51,914	18,374	\$424	27,185	3,630	3,362	5,553	9,971
5,570	40,436	15,088
3,992	5,240,976	3,988,026	20,087	1,510,196	418,770	286 178,	295,185,	1,191,478
17,893	15,508	11,774	308	4,414	1,167	380	1,629	7,446
954	8,161	4,425
.....	6,156	4,276
1,893	24,982	12,459
117,106	214,741	33,057	21,849	89,086	11,089	15,846	15,209	14,498
7,197	90,306	324	36,717
2,125	10,543	52	5,973
3,890	51,386	26,780
40	892	852
643	12,067	75	8,688
7,041	30,178	12,115
29,727	55,337	27,569
98,733	331,721	79,496

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.				APPROPRIATIONS FROM NET INCOME.			
OTHER DEDUCTIONS—Continued.							
Uncollectible Bills.	Interest on Funded Debt.	Interest on Unfunded Debt.	Miscellan- eous.	Amortisation and Depreciation of Plant.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Dividends Declared.	Sundries.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
.....	\$10,715	\$631	\$688	\$4,173	\$1,780	\$5,181	\$20
\$316	9,660	2,214	100	98	334
.....	7,200	148	13,478
15,570	1,917,464	600,000	300,000	1,246,389
.....	2,500	637	109	25,543
10	900	139
7	360	79
.....	4,604
.....
371	14,550	21	3,780
49	2,500	1,173
300	4,228	119	7,740	2,696
.....	9	600
.....	445	4,730	9,000
.....	1,005	1,280	11,414
.....	15,630	13,743	93,168	65,000

TABLE No. 36.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT AND GAS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917 (EXCLUSIVE OF SUCH FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK AS ARE HELD BY THE ISSUING CORPORATION), THE RATE PER CENT. AND DATES OF PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT, AND THE RATE PER CENT. AND AMOUNT OF DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON CAPITAL STOCK.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	FUNDED DEBT.				COMMON STOCK.			PREFERRED STOCK.		
	Description.	Date.	Term of Years.	Amount Outstanding.	Rate Per Cent.	Interest Payable.	Amount Outstanding.	Dividends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.	Amount Outstanding.
1	Annapolis Public Utilities Co.	1891	20	\$57,500	6	J. & J.	\$172,700	\$5,181	4	0
2	Electric Lt. & Power Co.	1903	50	119,500	5	A. & O.	0	0	0	0
3	Co.	1916	30	161,000	5	J. & D.	100,000	0	0	0
4	Electric Lt. & P. Co.	1912	35	17,000	5	A. & O.	15,000	0	0	0
5	Co.	1915	50	120,000	6	J. & J.	85,000	0	0	0
	General	1905	30	15,000,000	4½	J. & J.	14,285,800	1,150,832	8	(a) \$5,537
	Debenture	1913	0	8,377,980	5	M. & N.	0	0	0	0
	Gold Notes	1916	5	8,500,000	5	M. & N.	0	0	0	0
	Consols	1889	50	3,400,000	5	J. & J.	0	0	0	0
	General	1904	50	6,100,000	4½	A. & O.	0	0	0	0
	1st Mtge.	1899	30	4,428,000	4½	M. & N.	0	0	0	0
6	United Electric Light & Power Co.	1917	5	5,000,000	5	F. & A.	100	0	0	0
7	Consolidated Power Company	1904	20	20,000	5	J. & J.	25,540	0	0	0
	Mortgage	1908	30	30,000	5	A. & O.	0	0	0	0
	1st Mtge.	1911	20	30,000	6	July 1st	40,000	0	0	0
	Gen'l Mtge.	1915	5	6,000	6	J. & D.	18,000	0	0	0
8	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0
9	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	200,000	0	0	0
10	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	0	0
11	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	86,000	7,740	9	0
12	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	6,380	0	0	0
13	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	800	6	0
14	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	9,000	9	0
15	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	0	0
16	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	2,000,000	65,000	3½	0
17	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
52	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
53	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
56	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
58	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
59	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
61	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
62	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
64	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
66	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
67	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
68	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
71	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
72	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
73	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
74	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
75	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
76	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
77	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
78	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
79	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
80	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
81	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
82	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
83	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
84	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
85	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
86	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
87	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
88	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
89	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
90	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
91	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
92	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
93	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
94	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
96	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
97	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
98	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
99	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100	Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Natural Gas Companies.

(a) The Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Company retired during the year ended December 31, 1917, Preferred Stock outstanding \$3,341,454. See Public Service Commission Order No. 3132.

The dividends accumulated at time of retirement and paid by the company amounted to \$95,537.22

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT AND GAS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS OPERATING STAT
0—NONE; *—ABSENCE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		PRODUCTION PLANT, ETC.			
		Number of Benches.	Number of Retorts.	Number of Water Gas Sets.	Number of Holders.
		1	2	3	4
1	Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....	6	36	0	2
2	Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.....	3	17	0	2
3	Citizens' Gas Co.....	0	0	2	2
4	Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....	0	0	10	14
5	Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....	3	12	0	1
6	Crisfield Light & Power Co.....	0	0	1	1
7	Elkton Gas Light Co.....	2	6	0	1
8 (a)	Georgetown Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	0	0	0	0
9	Hagerstown & Frederick Ry. Co. (Elec. & Gas Depts.)	0	0	2	2
10	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.....	0	0	2	2
11	Havre de Grace Gas Co.....	0	0	1	1
12	Hyattsville Gas & Electric Co.....	4	24	0	1
13 (b)	Manchester Lighting & Heating Co.....	0	0	0	0
14 (a)	Washington Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	0	0	0	0
15	Northern Natural Gas Co.....	0	0	0	0
16	West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of Maryland.....	0	0	0	0
17	West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of West Virginia.	0	0	0	0

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		QUANTITIES MADE, BOUGHT AND SOLD DURING THE YEAR—Continued.			
		SOLD.			
		Coal Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Water Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Mixed Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Natural Gas, M. Cub. Ft.
		13	14	15	16
1	Annapolis Public Utilities Co.....	27,332	0	0	0
2	Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.....	9,914	0	0	0
3	Citizens' Gas Co.....	0	28,034	0	0
4	Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.....	0	0	5,535,546	0
5	Consolidated Public Utilities Co.....	8,401	0	0	0
6	Crisfield Light & Power Co.....	0	4,889	0	0
7	Elkton Gas Light Co.....	3,326,000	0	0	0
8 (a)	Georgetown Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	24,983	0	0	0
9	Hagerstown & Frederick Ry. Co. (Elec. & Gas Depts.)	25,388	0	0	0
10	Hagerstown Light & Heat Co.....	0	81,107	0	0
11	Havre de Grace Gas Co.....	0	6,968	0	0
12	Hyattsville Gas & Electric Co.....	28,319	0	0	0
13 (b)	Manchester Lighting & Heating Co.....	0	0	*	0
14 (a)	Washington Gas Light Co. of Montgomery Co.....	0	13,901	0	0
15	Northern Natural Gas Co.....	0	0	0	91,442
16	West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of Maryland.....	0	0	0	225,803
17	West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co. of West Virginia.	0	0	0	630,934

(a) Distributing Company, does not manufacture.
(b) Makes acetylene gas.

No. 37.

STICES FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917. THE CHARACTERS SHOWN IN THIS TABLE INDICATE AS FOLLOWS OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

PRODUCTION PLANT, ETC. —Continued.	DAILY CAPACITY OF PLANT.		QUANTITIES MADE, BOUGHT AND SOLD DURING THE YEAR.				
			MADE.			BOUGHT.	
Capacity of Holders, Cub. Ft.	Coal Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Water Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Coal Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Water Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Natural Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Coal Gas, M. Cub. Ft.	Natural Gas, M. Cub. Ft.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
85,000	225	0	32,729	0	0	0	0
30,000	75	0	13,651	0	0	0	0
60,000	0	300	0	29,971	0	0	0
13,400,000	0	26,000	0	3,154,507	0	2,710,351	0
33,000	*	0	*	0	0	0	0
20,000	0	50	0	5,500	0	0	0
15,000	85	0	3,326,000	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	24,983	0
46,424	0	150	29,901	0	0	0	0
330,000	0	930	0	92,372	0	0	0
20,000	0	100	0	*	0	0	0
60,000	180	0	30,793	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	13,901	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91,422
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225,803
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630,924

TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION MAINS, LENGTH IN FEET.			CONSUMERS.			
Above 12 Inches in Diameter.	Above 4 Inches but not above 12 Inches.	Above ½ Inch but not above 4 Inches.	Number of Street Lamps.	Price Per Year.	Number of Private Consumers.	Number of Meters in Service.
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
0	1,798	57,413	0	0	1,457	1,457
0	2,450	215,346	0	0	968	968
0	8,278	145,770	0	0	1,587	1,587
582,337	1,364,329	2,360,250	12,581	6.50	136,073	136,073
0	3,000	22,000	0	0	599	556
0	0	49,692	0	0	556	556
0	140	14,596	0	0	265	265
0	106,202	96,871	0	0	478	540
0	10,036	61,156	0	0	1,492	1,508
0	54,204	115,859	0	0	4,058	4,072
0	2,610	23,126	0	0	480	480
0	35,743	98,257	0	0	1,316	1,316
0	0	6,600	31	*	55	55
0	9,027	20,633	0	0	390	395
0	79,857	68,898	0	0	722	756
0	80,698	352,100	0	0	3,384	3,384
0	153,908	362,332	0	0	5,874	5,865

TABLE No. 39.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE WATER CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNTS OF ASSETS, OF LIABILITIES AND OF SURPLUS, ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF GROSS INCOME, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917. * ABSENCE OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

TOTALS.																							
ASSETS.				LIABILITIES.				SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.				GROSS INCOME.				DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.				NET INCOME.			
Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.		Increase Over Preceding Year.		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.		Increase Over Preceding Year.		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.		Increase Over Preceding Year.		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.		Increase Over Preceding Year.		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.		Increase Over Preceding Year.		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.		Increase Over Preceding Year.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12												
Electric Co.	\$264,837	\$130,467	\$251,166	\$130,536	\$3,671	\$9,252	\$12,352	\$6,371	\$14,306	\$2,881	\$1,864												
.....	2,644,085	22,297	2,174,759	6,137	16,160	208,588	6,476	147,539	814,306	61,029	91,864												
.....	100,388	185	107,463	298	113	6,609	*	6,609	*	153	*												
.....	32,826	148	30,290	120	28	2,062	*	1,466	*	596	*												
.....	26,821	85	24,391	104	19	1,827	137	1,808	167	19	39												
W. Co.	194,424	14,670	181,344	10,677	3,993	8,129	*	4,136	*	3,983	*												
.....	3,133	92	2,623	8	84	152	56	62	9	100	47												
Co., W. D.	207,278	4,451	215,142	13,677	9,226	14,142	1,044	15,020	1,149	1,378	165												
.....	118,425	*	119,521	*	1,066	22,801	*	18,299	*	4,502	*												
.....	16,510	79	11,950	4,680	1,379	18	1,300	160	79	118												
.....	132,901	495	125,667	7,284	9,757	*	9,262	*	495	*												
.....	138,808	2,022	109,300	975	29,308	9,997	2,065	6,849	225	4,648	1,840												
.....	20,810	188	12,470	713	8,340	3,485	*	1,013	*	2,472	*												
.....	72,974	192	70,403	47	2,571	4,147	938	3,454	315	693	623												
.....	30,545	723	10,207	3	20,368	3,331	*	1,928	*	1,408	*												
.....	23,138	3,738	18,254	1,431	4,884	2,262	*	1,722	*	1,540	*												
.....	31,159	256	30,510	230	486	1,745	1,182	1,211	811	584	371												
.....	267,927	10,661	256,477	6,920	3,741	39,336	620	27,881	537	11,455	93												
.....	204,225	12,225	202,710	10,710	1,515	11,242	*	9,207	*	2,015	*												
.....	27,669	115	28,838	602	487	3,518	1,775	2,349	1,025	1,169	750												
.....	22,748	8	22,889	110	162	1,423	*	326	*	1,102	*												

Note—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE
SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE WATER CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF ASSETS, THE TOTAL
ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.			
		ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
		Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2	3	4
1	Artesian Water Co.....	\$254,837	\$130,467	\$251,166	\$130,586
2	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	2,644,085	22,297	2,174,759	6,137
3	Bel Air Water & Light Co.....	100,388	185	107,463	298
4	Boonsboro Water Co.....	32,826	148	30,290	120
5	Braddock Heights Water Co.....	26,921	85	24,391	104
6	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co.....	194,424	14,670	181,344	10,677
7	Burkittsville Water Co.....	3,133	92	2,623	8
8	Consolidated Public Utilities Co., Water Dept.....	207,278	4,451	215,142	13,677
9	Dorchester Water Co.....	118,425	*	119,521	*
10	Frostburg Water Co.....	16,610	79	11,950
11	Havre de Grace Water Co.....	132,901	495	125,667
12	Lonaconing Water Co.....	138,608	2,022	109,300	975
13	Mechanicstown Water Co.....	20,810	166	12,470	713
14	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.....	72,974	192	70,403	47
15	Perryville Water Co.....	30,565	723	10,207	3
16	Port Deposit Water Co.....	23,138	3,738	18,254	1,665
17	Rognel Heights Water Co.....	31,159	256	30,510	239
18	Roland Park Water Co.....	267,927	10,661	256,477	6,920
19	Suburban Water Co.....	204,225	12,225	202,710	10,710
20	Union Bridge Water Co.....	27,669	115	28,838	602
21	Walkersville Water Co.....	22,748	8	22,889	110

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF ASSETS —Continued.		DETAILS OF LIABILITIES.	
		Unextin- guished Discount on Securities.	Sundries.	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.
		14	15	16	17
1	Artesian Water Co.....	\$155,050	\$85,000
2	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	\$56,355	\$5,428	390,000	925,000
3	Bel Air Water & Light Co.....	49,500	48,800
4	Boonsboro Water Co.....	10,000	10,000
5	Braddock Heights Water Co.....	8	8,500	9,500
6	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co.....	100,000	50,000
7	Burkittsville Water Co.....	2,110
8	Consolidated Public Utilities Co., Water Dept.....	102,000	85,000
9	Dorchester Water Co.....	103,970
10	Frostburg Water Co.....	9,950
11	Havre de Grace Water Co.....	75,000	50,000
12	Lonaconing Water Co.....	70,000	32,000
13	Mechanicstown Water Co.....	9,500
14	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.....	22,714	41,500	27,000
15	Perryville Water Co.....	506	10,200
16	Port Deposit Water Co.....	10,000	5,000
17	Rognel Heights Water Co.....	15,000	15,000
18	Roland Park Water Co.....	840	50,000	169,000
19	Suburban Water Co.....	100,000	92,000
20	Union Bridge Water Co.....	11,745	10,000
21	Walkersville Water Co.....	20,000

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 40.

AMOUNT OF LIABILITIES, THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SURPLUS ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH
* ABSENCE OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

TOTALS—Continued.		DETAILS OF ASSETS.						
SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.								
Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Cost of Plant.	Cash.	Bills and Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Invest- ments.	Sinking Funds.	Special Deposits and Pre- payments.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$3,671	\$119	\$123,144	\$2,474	\$8,595	\$2,034			
469,326	16,160	2,241,214	5,403	70,265	3,959	\$252,272	\$519	\$8,668
7,075	113	100,205	2		180			
2,536	28	25,545	295	486			6,500	
2,530	19	26,715	32	155	10			
13,080	3,993	187,697	148	6,275	303			
510	84	2,947	106	80				
7,884	9,228	199,590	3,936	4,605		7,000		20
1,096	*	110,753		7,672				
4,660	79	15,000	174	1,361	75			
7,234	495	125,472	2,442	4,687	300			
29,308	1,047	129,426	2,008	2,081	94	5,000		
8,340	547	17,599	1,780	1,328	102			
2,571	239	45,595	247	952	140	3,325		
20,358	720	29,382	163	514				
4,884	2,073	17,068	101	829	80	5,000		
649	486	30,754	120	49	235			
11,450	3,741	249,657	3,357	10,777	2,614		588	93
1,515	1,515	194,474		7,243	1,100		1,408	
3,831	487	26,286	532	848				
141	102	22,720	17	12				

DETAILS OF LIABILITIES—Continued.

Interest on Funded and Other Debt.	Taxes Accrued.	Bills and Accounts Payable.	Customers' Deposits.	Dividends Payable.	Sundries.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Reserve for Depreciation.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
\$450		\$9,522	\$1,144				
7,625		62,615	35,665	\$7,800	\$470,216	\$600	\$275,238
737		8,427					
		10,290					
186		6,205					
4,996		8,327	11,020				7,000
		513					
977		10,394				224	16,547
		15,552					
		2,000					
667							
800							6,500
		220					2,750
450		1,000					453
		7					
	\$18	2,731				38	467
500	10						
704	707	5,633	1,428				29,005
1,840		8,370				500	
				20			2,072
		40					2,849

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE WATER CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE GROSS INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES, SURPLUS FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917. THE CHARACTERS

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.			
		Gross Income from All Sources.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Deductions from Gross Income.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
		1	2	3	4
1	Artesian Water Co.....	\$9,252	*	\$6,371	*
2	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	208,568	\$12,352	147,539	\$14,306
3	Bel Air Water & Light Co.....	6,476	*	6,609	*
4	Boonsboro Water Co.....	2,062	*	1,466	*
5	Braddock Heights Water Co.....	1,827	137	1,808	167
6	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co.....	8,129	*	4,136	*
7	Burkittsville Water Co.....	152	58	52	9
8	Consolidated Public Utilities Co., Water Dept.....	14,142	1,044	16,020	1,149
9	Dorchester Water Co.....	22,801	*	18,299	*
10	Frostburg Water Co.....	1,379	18	1,300	160
11	Havre de Grace Water Co.....	9,757	*	9,262	*
12	Lonaconing Water Co.....	9,997	2,065	5,349	225
13	Mechanicstown Water Co.....	3,485	*	1,013	*
14	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.....	4,147	938	3,454	315
15	Perryville Water Co.....	3,331	*	1,928	*
16	Port Deposit Water Co.....	2,262	*	722	*
17	Rognel Heights Water Co.....	1,745	1,182	1,211	811
18	Roland Park Water Co.....	39,336	620	27,881	527
19	Suburban Water Co.....	11,242	*	9,207	*
20	Union Bridge Water Co.....	3,518	1,775	2,349	1,025
21	Walkersville Water Co.....	1,428	*	326	*

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.			
		OPERATING EXPENSES.			
		Collecting and Pumping Systems.	Distribution.	Repairs.	General Expenses.
		13	14	15	16
1	Artesian Water Co.....	\$3,218	0	\$265	\$2,540
2	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	42,725	\$1,663	11,558	32,821
3	Bel Air Water & Light Co.....	905	288	30	2,182
4	Boonsboro Water Co.....	0	8	75	332
5	Braddock Heights Water Co.....	304	64	177	236
6	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co.....	11,519	2,927	548	2,995
7	Burkittsville Water Co.....	0	0	0	0
8	Consolidated Public Utilities Co., Water Dept.....	8,167	144	595	2,649
9	Dorchester Water Co.....	9,505	181	196	3,329
10	Frostburg Water Co.....	0	0	59	1,021
11	Havre de Grace Water Co.....	3,780	0	470	2,062
12	Lonaconing Water Co.....	170	453	106	2,567
13	Mechanicstown Water Co.....	0	0	143	542
14	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.....	69	95	518	1,213
15	Perryville Water Co.....	217	0	129	1,159
16	Port Deposit Water Co.....	131	16	47	252
17	Rognel Heights Water Co.....	409	0	18	402
18	Roland Park Water Co.....	9,404	480	1,285	5,818
19	Suburban Water Co.....	3,870	33	142	1,946
20	Union Bridge Water Co.....	1,217	40	65	240
21	Walkersville Water Co.....	0	20	4	64

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 41.

THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME, THE NET INCOME, THE APPROPRIATIONS FROM NET INCOME, AND THE SHOWN IN THIS TABLE INDICATE AS FOLLOWS: 0—NONE; * ABSENCE OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

TOTALS—Continued.						REVENUE.	
Net Income.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Appropriations from Net Income.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Surplus or Deficit.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Operating Revenue.	Non-Operating Revenue.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
\$2,881	*	\$3,000	*	\$119	*	\$9,252	0
61,029	\$1,954	\$44,869	*	16,160	*	195,157	\$13,411
133	*	20	*	113	*	6,476	0
596	*	568	*	28	*	1,737	325
19	30	0	*	19	*	18	37
3,993	*	0	0	3,993	*	8,062	67
100	47	16	*	84	*	152	0
1,878	105	0	*	1,878	*	13,656	486
4,502	*	6,288	*	1,726	*	22,759	42
79	118	0	0	79	*	1,379	0
495	*	0	0	495	*	9,231	526
4,648	1,840	3,600	*	1,048	*	9,997	0
2,472	*	1,925	*	547	*	3,485	0
693	623	453	*	240	*	4,147	0
1,403	*	2,124	*	721	*	3,331	0
1,540	*	767	*	2,307	*	2,262	0
534	371	47	*	487	*	1,745	0
11,455	93	7,713	*	3,742	*	38,724	612
2,015	*	500	*	1,515	*	11,242	0
1,169	750	1,657	*	488	*	3,513	5
1,102	*	1,000	*	102	*	1,428	0

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Continued.				APPROPRIATIONS FROM NET INCOME.			
NON-OPERATING EXPENSES.							
Taxes.	Uncollectible Bills.	Interest on Funded and Other Debt.	Miscellaneous.	Depreciation of Plant.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Dividends.	Other Deductions.
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
\$326	\$21	0	0	0	0	\$3,000	0
11,852	903	\$46,015	0	\$27,836	0	15,600	\$1,445
150	0	3,054	0	0	0	0	20
60	0	986	\$5	0	0	300	267
57	0	950	0	0	0	0	0
892	0	3,244	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	40	0	0	0	0	16
1,004	0	3,399	63	0	0	0	0
3,168	1,080	840	0	1,610	0	3,119	1,500
58	0	12)	42	0	0	0	0
949	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	0
328	93	1,632	0	1,500	0	2,100	0
328	0	0	0	500	0	1,425	0
202	140	1,215	0	453	0	0	0
424	0	0	0	282	0	1,836	6
64	0	202	0	234	0	0	1,000
7	0	375	0	47	0	0	0
2,016	36	8,641	200	7,557	0	0	155
454	0	2,760	0	0	\$500	0	0
187	0	600	0	600	0	1,057	0
232	0	7	0	0	0	1,000	0

TABLE No. 42.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE WATER CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917
(REQUIREMENTS OF SUCH FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK AS ARE HELD BY THE ISSUING CORPORATION), THE RATE PER CENT. AND DATES
OF PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT, AND THE RATE PER CENT. AND AMOUNT OF DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON
CAPITAL STOCK.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	FUNDING DEBT.					COMMON STOCK.		Paid-up Stock.		
	Description.	Date.	Term of Years.	Amount Out-standing.	Interest.		Amount Out-standing.	Dividends Declared During the Year.	Rate Per Cent.	Amount Out-standing.
					Rate Per Cent.	Dates When Payable.				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Electric Company.	1st Mtge.	1915	30	\$85,000	6	J. & J.	\$155,050	\$ 3,000	2	
	1st Mtge.	1906	40	895,000	5	M. & N.	390,000	15,800	4	
	Mortgage	1891	30	22,000	5	M. & B.	49,500			
	Mortgage	1914	30	24,000	5	A. & O.				
	Notes	1911	3	2,800	5	F. & A.				
	Mortgage	1908	20	10,000	5	J. & J.	10,000	300	3	
	Mortgage	1914	10	9,500	5	A. & O.	8,500			
	Mortgage	1914	5	50,000	5	June 15	100,000			
							2,110			

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE WATER CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS STATISTICS RELATING TO THE
THIS TABLE INDICATE AS FOLLOWS: 0—None;

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		SUPPLY SYSTEM.		
		Number of Reservoirs and Stand Pipes.	Capacity in Gallons.	Number of Wells.
		1	2	3
1	Artesian Water Co.....	1	50,000	5
2	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	10	95,368,000	14
3	Bel Air Water & Light Co.....	2	3,000,000	2
4	Boonsboro Water Co.....	2	225,000	0
5	Braddock Heights Water Co.....	5	478,000	1
6	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co.....	3	480,000	9
7	Burkittsville Water Co.....	2	40,000	0
8	Consolidated Public Utilities Co., Water Dept.....	4	2,180,000	24
9	Dorchester Water Co.....	1	143,000	5
10	Frostburg Water Co.....	1	200,000	2
11	Havre de Grace Water Co.....	1	2,500,000	0
12	Lonaconing Water Co.....	3	7,000,000	2
13	Mechanicstown Water Co.....	2	200,000	0
14	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.....	1	3,000,000	0
15	Perryville Water Co.....	1	3,000,000	0
16	Port Deposit Water Co.....	1	200,000	1
17	Rognel Heights Water Co.....	6	168,500	0
18	Roland Park Water Co.....	4	1,446,278	40
19	Suburban Water Co.....	3	150,000	7
20	Union Bridge Water Co.....	1	425,000	6
21	Walkersville Water Co.....	1	500,000	0

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		PUMPING SYSTEM—Continued.		
		Number of Water Wheels.	Rated Horse Power.	Number of Tons of Coal Used.
		12	13	14
1	Artesian Water Co.....	0	0	0
2	Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	2	400	3,244
3	Bel Air Water & Light Co.....	0	0	0
4	Boonsboro Water Co.....	0	0	0
5	Braddock Heights Water Co.....	0	0	0
6	Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co.....	0	0	0
7	Burkittsville Water Co.....	0	0	0
8	Consolidated Public Utilities Co., Water Dept.....	1	15	517
9	Dorchester Water Co.....	0	0	0
10	Frostburg Water Co.....	0	0	0
11	Havre de Grace Water Co.....	0	0	400
12	Lonaconing Water Co.....	0	0	0
13	Mechanicstown Water Co.....	0	0	0
14	Midland-Elk Lick Water Co.....	0	0	0
15	Perryville Water Co.....	0	0	0
16	Port Deposit Water Co.....	0	0	0
17	Rognel Heights Water Co.....	0	0	0
18	Roland Park Water Co.....	0	0	0
19	Suburban Water Co.....	0	0	0
20	Union Bridge Water Co.....	0	0	0
21	Walkersville Water Co.....	0	0	0

No. 43.

SUPPLY AND SERVICE OF THE SAME, FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917. THE CHARACTERS SHOWN IN *—ABSENCE OF REQUIRED FIGURES.

SUPPLY SYSTEM—Cont.		PUMPING SYSTEM.					
Drainage Area, Sq. Miles.	Purification System Used.	Number of Pumps.	Rated Daily Capacity, Gallons.	Number of Boilers.	Rated Horse Power.	Number of Steam or Gas Engines.	Rated Horse Power.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
* 325	0 Sand & Chem.	7	126,900	0	0	5	8
* 2	0	6	21,000,000	5	750	3	800
* 15	0	0	0	0	0	1	*
* 0	0	3	150,000	0	0	1	25
* 0	0	2	100,000	2	300	2	250
* 0	Sand	4	0	0	0	0	0
* 2	0	4	1,800,000	2	180	1	25
0	0	4	1,500,000	1	80	1	50
0 10	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
0 4	0	1	72,000	1	165	1	12
0 6	0	0	0	0	20	0	0
0 75	Chemical	0	0	0	0	0	0
0 0	Chemical	1	28,800	0	0	1	2
0 0	0	1	221,760	0	0	2	20
0 *	0	5	1,042,560	0	0	1	75
	Chemical	5	*	0	0	4	73
	Chemical	2	120,000	0	0	2	50
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.

Length of Mains, Miles.	Sizes of Mains, Inches.	Number of Main Pipe Valves.	Number of Fire Hydrants.	Number of Consumers.	Number of Services.	Number of Meters.	Number of Fountains and Troughs.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
7.75	2 to 6	51	21	387	387	385	0
150.39	1 to 20	931	446	10,882	10,882	4,694	2
8.00	4 to 12	48	48	354	354	354	1
3.90	2 to 8	15	20	120	122	0	0
*	2 to 6	20	19	75	75	73	1
14.58	4 to 8	65	66	934	934	934	1
.80	4	5	0	18	18	0	0
19.63	1 to 10	131	93	1,000	1,006	410	3
*	1 to 10	62	48	1,979	1,979	78	3
17.84	1 to 8	14	1	160	145	0	0
12.50	4 to 10	*	58	690	690	275	0
10.00	4 to 12	60	34	739	*	34	0
4.00	2 to 6	*	29	215	210	2	0
7.00	1 to 10	24	10	376	376	4	0
3.14	4 to 12	17	11	202	136	4	0
2.00	4 to 8	5	16	131	131	0	1
.55	4	26	4	72	70	70	0
18.34	1 to 10	260	122	1,074	1,074	1,062	0
12.28	1 to 8	214	18	1,343	1,343	1,343	0
2.50	4 to 8	21	16	450	450	3	1
6.00	4 to 8	*	27	625	125	25	0

TABLE No. 45.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNTS OF ASSETS, OF LIABILITIES AND OF SURPLUS, ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF GROSS INCOME, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE INCREASES OR DECREASES FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR.

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.						TOTALS.					
	ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.		SURPLUS OR DEFICIT		GROSS INCOME.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.		NET INCOME.	
	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	\$29,470	\$11,624	\$25,536	\$9,362	\$3,934	\$2,262	\$6,903	*	\$5,196	*	\$1,707	*
2	16,370,251	1,732,964	15,310,747	1,565,532	1,059,504	167,432	4,401,886	\$400,482	3,247,439	\$373,157	1,054,447	\$37,325
3	141,711	1,395	138,620	19	3,091	1,376	6,752	*	5,376	*	1,376	*
4	2,557,958	17,760	3,392,572	114,444	\$34,619	132,194	25,848	669	145,043	4,717	119,095	5,385
5	14,286	..	13,940	298	346	298	2,198	74	1,900	189	298	114
6	8,500	914	7,145	260	1,355	654	2,675	*	1,621	*	1,054	*
7	1,264,546	*	1,265,423	*	10,877	*	1,879,980	*	1,402,073	*	477,906	*
8	4,117	11	2,295	139	1,822	129	1,623	*	1,426	*	197	*
9	9,904	543	9,614	435	1,290	978	2,083	*	3,052	*	978	*

Asterisk (*) denotes absence of required figures.

Note—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF OF SUCH ASSETS

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.		
	ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.
	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.
	1	2	3
1 Cecil Farmers' Telephone Co.....	\$29,470	\$11,624	\$25,536
2 Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	16,370,251	1,732,964	15,310,747
3 Cumberland Valley Telephone Co.....	141,711	1,395	138,620
4 Maryland Telephone Co. of Baltimore.....	2,557,953	17,750	3,392,572
5 Maryland & Delaware Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	14,286	13,940
6 Poolesville Telephone Co.....	8,500	914	7,145
7 Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.....	1,254,546	*	1,265,423
8 Princess Anne Telephone Co.....	4,117	11	2,295
9 Union Telephone Co.....	9,904	543	9,614

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF ASSETS—Cont.		
	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Special Deposits and Pre- payments.	Sundries.
	12	13	14
1 Cecil Farmers' Telephone Co.....
2 Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	\$24,449	\$1,039
3 Cumberland Valley Telephone Co.....
4 Maryland Telephone Co. of Baltimore.....	27
5 Maryland & Delaware Telephone & Telegraph Co.....
6 Poolesville Telephone Co.....	3,495
7 Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.....
8 Princess Anne Telephone Co.....
9 Union Telephone Co.....

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.
* Denotes required figures not given.

No. 46.

ASSETS, THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF LIABILITIES AND THE SURPLUS ON DECEMBRE 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION AND LIABILITIES.

TOTALS—Cont.			DETAILS OF ASSETS.				
LIABILITIES —Cont.	SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.						
Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount Dec. 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Cost of Plant.	Cash.	Bills and Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Investments.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
\$9,362	\$3,934	\$2,262	\$27,620	\$408	\$1,144	\$298
1,565,532	1,059,504	167,432	15,324,566	130,366	561,653	328,117	\$60
19	3,091	1,376	134,830	25	2,776	80	4,000
114,444	834,619	132,194	2,473,795	609	2	83,520
298	346	298	14,286
260	1,355	654	3,930	209	826	40
*	10,877	*	50,000	102,796	1,096,134	5,615
139	1,822	128	3,801	4	312
435	290	978	6,865	1,815	956	268

DETAILS OF LIABILITIES.

Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Interest Accrued on Funded and Other Debt.	Taxes Accrued and Unpaid.	Bills and Accounts Payable.	Sub- scribers' Deposits.	Dividends Payable.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Reserve for Deprecia- tion.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
\$13,525	\$1,500	\$3,381	\$7,131
10,000	\$240,289	11,761,340	\$1,966	\$144,111	3,153,042
128,600	19	1
1,000,000	43	2,392,529
11,120	2,820
3,930	3,215
50,000	314,823	900,600
1,000	167	728	400
6,500	1,114	2,000

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE GROSS INCOME
INCOME AND THE SURPLUS FROM THE OPERATION

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.		
		Gross Income from all Sources.	Deductions from Gross Income.	Net Income.
		1	2	3
1	Cecil Farmers' Telephone Co.....	\$6,903	\$5,196	\$1,707
2	Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	4,401,886	3,347,439	1,054,447
3	Cumberland Valley Telephone Co.....	6,752	5,376	1,376
4	Maryland Telephone Co. of Baltimore.....	25,948	145,043	119,095
5	Maryland & Delaware Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	2,198	1,900	298
6	Poolesville Telephone Co.....	2,675	1,621	1,054
7	Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.....	1,879,980	1,402,078	477,906
8	Princess Anne Telephone Co.....	1,623	1,426	197
9	Union Telephone Co.....	2,083	3,062	978

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Cont.		
		General Expense.	Taxes.	Uncollectible Bills.
		11	12	13
1	Cecil Farmers' Telephone Co.....	\$558	\$472	\$20
2	Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	402,684	359,888	26,871
3	Cumberland Valley Telephone Co.....	54	729	35
4	Maryland Telephone Co. of Baltimore.....	4,946	465	4
5	Maryland & Delaware Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	29	37	
6	Poolesville Telephone Co.....	178	129	
7	Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.....	74,193	38,393	5,566
8	Princess Anne Telephone Co.....	243	101	
9	Union Telephone Co.....	414	144	

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 47.

FROM ALL SOURCES, THE DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME, THE NET INCOME, THE APPROPRIATIONS FROM NET OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

TOTALS—Cont.		REVENUE.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.		
Appropriations from Net Income.	Surplus or Deficit.	Operating Revenue.	Non-Operating Revenue.	Traffic Expense.	Repairs.	Commercial Expense.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
\$555	\$2,262	\$6,903	\$2,197	\$1,572	\$223
887,014	167,433	4,393,734	\$8,152	915,076	468,979	529,968
.....	1,376	6,742	10	1,415	2,429	713
13,099	132,194	25,851	97	340	896	8
.....	2,198	1,834
400	654	2,562	113	750	444	120
475,000	2,906	1,462,973	417,007	1,050,523	233,398
325	128	1,623	812	270
.....	978	2,083	420	2,084
DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Cont.				APPROPRIATIONS FROM NET INCOME.		
Interest on Funded Debt.	Interest on Unfunded Debt.	Sundries.	Depreciation of Plant.	Sinking Fund and Optional Reserves.	Dividends Declared.	Sundries.
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
.....	\$100	\$53	\$555
.....	643,896	77	885,094	\$1,920
.....	138,268	124	13,099
.....	400
.....	475,000
.....	75	250
.....

TABLE No. 48.

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE TOTAL FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK OUTSTANDING ON DECEMBER 31, 1917 (EXCLUSIVE OF SUCH FUNDED DEBT AND CAPITAL STOCK AS ARE HELD BY THE ISSUING CORPORATION), THE RATES PER CENT. AND DATES OF PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT, AND THE RATE PER CENT. AND AMOUNT OF DIVIDENDS DECLARED ON CAPITAL STOCK.

TITLES OF CORPORATION.	FURNACE DEBT.						COMMON STOCK.			PREFERRED STOCK.
	Description.	Date.	Term of Years.	Amount Out-standing.	Interest.		Amount Out-standing.	Divi- dends Declared During Year.	Rate Per Cent.	Amount Out- standing.
					Rate Per Cent.	Dates Payable.				
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
.....	Mortgage	1917	5	\$1,500	5	J. & D.	\$12,525
.....	10,000
.....	138,800
.....	1,000,000
.....	11,120
.....	3,930
.....	50,000
.....	1,000
.....	6,500
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

TITLE OF CORPORATION.

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN VARIOUS OPERATING
FOLLOWS:

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		STATIONS.		
		Exchange Stations.	Private Branch Stations.	Extension Sets Owned.
		1	2	3
1	Cecil Farmers' Telephone Co.....	366	0	14
2	Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	80,709	20,088	12,512
3	Cumberland Valley Telephone Co.....	851	0	0
4	Maryland Telephone Co. of Baltimore.....	7	0	0
5	Maryland & Delaware Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	0	0	0
6	Poolesville Telephone Co.....	0	0	0
7	Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.....	0	0	0
8	Princess Anne Telephone Co.....	97	0	3
9	Union Telephone Co.....	136	0	0

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		PLANT MILEAGE—Cont.		
		Miles of Underground Wire.		Miles of Submarine Wire.
		Exchange.	Toll.	Exchange.
		13	14	15
1	CC	0	0	0
2	CC	187,148	9,219	196
3	CC	0	0	0
4	MM	0	0	0
5	MM	0	0	0
6	PP	0	0	0
7	PP	0	0	0
8	PP	0	0	0
9	U	0	0	0

No. 49.

STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917. THE CHARACTER SHOWN IN THIS TABLE INDICATES AS 0—NONE.

STATIONS—Cont.					PLANT MILEAGE.			
Total Owned.	Service Stations.	Private Line Stations.	Connected Stations.	Total All Stations.	Miles of Poles.		Miles of Aerial Wire.	
					Exchange.	Toll.	Exchange.	Toll.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
380	0	0	0	380	75	9	355	18
113,309	1,899	1,325	884	117,417	3,390	1,687	91,373	24,536
351	0	0	0	351	17	77	452	256
7	0	0	98	105	63	123	698	691
0	14	0	0	14	54 68-100	0	115 65-100	0
0	0	0	144	144	40	0	63	0
0	0	0	0	0	342 11-100	0	5,106 69-100	0
100	90	0	0	190	30	0	73	0
136	0	0	0	136	68	0	295	0

PLANT MILE- AGE—Cont.	NUMBER OF EXCHANGES.						
Miles of Submarine Wire.	Having Over 5,000 Stations.	Having From 1,000 to 5,000.	Having From 500 to 1,000.	Having From 300 to 500.	Having From 100 to 300.	Having Less than 100.	Total.
Toll.	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
357	1	9	11	14	56	23	114
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE EXPRESS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE AMOUNT

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	INVESTMENT.			
	Real Property and Equipment.	Miscellaneous Physical Property.	Stocks of Other Companies.	Bonds of Other Companies.
	1	2	3	4
1 Adams Express Company	\$9,423,982	\$57,419	\$18,056,069	\$21,080,685
2 American Express Company	18,882,988	2,051,078	4,565,833	9,791,169
3 Southern Express Company	2,703,071	165,833	179,200	200,450
4 Wells Fargo & Company	12,046,774	198,086	5,455,962	12,222,617

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	CURRENT ASSETS—Continued.			
	Miscellaneous Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.	Interest, Rents and Dividends Receivable.	Other Current Assets.
	13	14	15	16
1 Adams Express Company	\$742,735	\$211,474	\$258,510
2 American Express Company	6,301,384	564,132	202,554	\$94,270
3 Southern Express Company	88,557	64,470	22,650	3,418
4 Wells Fargo & Company	1,315,036	438,015	196,964	344,333

No. 51.

OF ASSETS ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH ASSETS.

INVESTMENT—Continued.			CURRENT ASSETS.				
Notes of Other Companies.	Advances to Affiliated Companies.	Total Investment.	Cash.	Special Deposits.	Loans and Notes Receivable.	Traffic Balances Receivable.	Net Balances Due from Agents and Messengers.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
\$740,002	\$240,810	\$49,598,967	\$1,860,797	\$28,157	\$65,000	\$209,224	\$5,421,391
1,109,840	36,400,908	2,876,002	42,673	5,471	201,775	10,960,231
.....	3,248,054	1,539,642	1,400,035	95,526	1,322,673
1,578,996	81,502,435	8,978,505	293,586	118,230	3,195,325

CURRENT ASSETS—Cont.	DEFERRED AND UNADJUSTED DEBITS.						
Total Current Assets.	Insurance and Other Reserve Funds.	Advance Payments on Contracts.	Rent and Insurance Premiums Paid in Advance.	Taxes Paid in Advance.	Other Deferred and Unadjusted Debits.	Total Deferred and Unadjusted Debits.	Total Assets.
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
\$8,797,287	\$34,650	\$32,550	\$278,464	\$345,664	\$58,741,919
21,248,492	438,505	48,890	\$33,791	1,040,076	1,561,262	59,210,663
4,536,972	3,613	17,814	21,427	7,806,454
14,879,994	\$1,086,666	95,638	88,090	47,652,823

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE EXPRESS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE AMOUNT OF

TITLE OF CORPORATION.			CURRENT LIABILITIES
	Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Loans and Notes Payable.
	1	2	3
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$10,000,000	\$20,736,500	\$4,400,000
2 American Express Company.....	17,249,000	18,000
3 Southern Express Company.....
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	23,967,400	500,000

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	CURRENT LIABILITIES —Cont.	DEFERRED LIABILITIES AND UNADJUSTED CREDITS.	
	Other Current Liabilities.	Liability on Account of Provident Funds.	Liability on Account of Fidelity and Indemnity Funds.
	12	13	14
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$33,450
2 American Express Company.....	\$11,949
3 Southern Express Company.....	\$202,250	13,950	21,970
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	1,283,214

No. 52.

LIABILITIES ON DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH LIABILITIES.

CURRENT LIABILITIES—Continued.

Traffic Balances Payable.	Audited Accounts and Wages Unpaid.	Miscella- neous Accounts Payable.	Matured Interest, Dividends and Rents Unpaid.	Unpaid Money Orders, Cheques and Drafts.	Express Privilege Liabilities.	Estimated Tax Liability.	Unmatured Interest, Dividends and Rents Payable.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
.....	\$2,265,975	\$492,531	\$54,211	\$1,385,990	\$4,230,736	\$100,000	\$225,001
\$38,126	5,126,790	9,269,581	31,696	8,176,104	5,106,520	295,181	260,929
157,941	425,954	116,098	532,702	653,956	419,015
48,193	5,888,394	20,287	4,493,942	3,266,586	413,836	360,078

DEFERRED LIABILITIES AND UNADJUSTED CREDITS
—Continued.

CORPORATE SURPLUS.

Operating and Insurance Reserves.	Accrued Depreciation, Buildings.	Accrued Depreciation, Equipment.	Other Deferred and Unadjusted Credits.	Reserves from Income and Surplus.	Profit and Loss Balance.	Corporate Surplus.	Total Liabilities.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
\$215,202	\$250,052	\$2,529,539	\$234,434	\$2,690,992	\$8,015,005	\$10,705,997	\$53,741,919
959,454	1,205,132	3,624,634	1,623,699	6,213,917	6,213,917	59,210,663
200,564	228,449	909,197	32,246	3,892,152	3,892,152	7,806,454
572,466	323,262	2,358,871	34,008	4,122,785	4,122,785	47,652,823

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE EXPRESS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE INCOME ACCOUNT

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	OPERATING INCOME.				
	Charges for Transporta- tion.	Express Privileges. Dr.	Revenue from Transporta- tion.	Revenue from Operations Other Than Transporta- tion.	Total Operating Revenue.
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$53,730,035	\$26,707,165	\$27,022,870	\$630,830	\$27,653,700
2 American Express Company.....	75,920,881	87,715,796	38,205,035	3,894,238	42,099,273
3 Southern Express Company.....	19,300,341	9,924,641	9,375,700	395,746	9,771,447
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	59,813,391	31,586,820	28,227,071	1,351,269	29,578,340

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	OTHER INCOME—Continued.				
	Dividend Income.	Income from Funded Securities.	Income from Unfunded Securities and Accounts.	Income from Reserve Funds.	Miscella- neous Income.
	14	15	16	17	18
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$1,104,495	\$1,090,654	\$98,533
2 American Express Company.....	169,095	454,364	106,340	\$19,578	\$45,832
3 Southern Express Company.....	6,300	176	75,332	26
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	324,781	515,324	163,068	84,467

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME—Cont.		DISPOSITION OF NET INCOME:		PROFIT AND LOSS CREDITS.
	Total Deductions from Gross Income.	Net Income.	Dividends Declared.	Income Balance Transferred to Profit and Loss.	Balance at Beginning of Year.
	27	28	29	30	31
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$1,056,064	\$1,884,548	\$1,884,548	\$10,350,433
2 American Express Company.....	282,300	1,257,593	1,257,593	6,923,549
3 Southern Express Company.....	16,774	1,024,596	\$800,000	224,596	3,647,150
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	119,394	1,624,852	1,438,044	186,808	4,020,094

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 53.

FOR THE YEAR AND THE PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT ON DECEMBER 31, 1917.

OPERATING INCOME—Continued.					OTHER INCOME.		
Operating Expenses. Dr.	Net Operating Revenue.	Uncollectible Revenue from Transportation.	Express Taxes. Dr.	Operating Income.	Rent from Real Property and Equipment Used Jointly.	Income from Miscellaneous Physical Property.	Separately Operated Properties.
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
\$30,476,896	\$2,823,196	\$20,745	\$293,247	\$3,137,187	\$13,964	\$1,064
40,831,310	1,267,963	26,469	562,310	679,184	17,048	48,452
8,170,055	1,601,392	2,220	649,952	949,220	6,653	8,664
28,397,532	1,180,808	17,542	511,849	651,416	4,151	1,038

OTHER INCOME—Continued.		DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.					
Total Other Income.	Gross Income.	Rent for Real Property and Equipment Used Jointly.	Miscellaneous Rents.	Miscellaneous Taxes.	Interest on Funded Debt.	Interest on Unfunded Debt.	Miscellaneous Income Debits.
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
\$2,308,709	\$828,478	\$9,842	\$10,648	\$910	\$871,988	\$153,341	\$9,339
860,709	1,539,893	10,524	28,701	27,655	216,038	382
92,151	1,041,370	10,750	762	4,949	240	74
1,092,829	1,744,246	8,001	27,662	82,324	651	756

PROFIT AND LOSS—Continued.							
CREDITS—Continued.				DEBITS.			
Credit Balance Transferred from Income.	Delayed Income Credits.	Unrefundable Overcharges.	Miscellaneous Credits.	Dividend Appropriations of Surplus.	Delayed Income Debits.	Miscellaneous Debits.	Credit Balance Carried to Balance Sheet.
32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
\$1,884,542	\$869	\$104,198	\$550,000	\$5,953	\$8,015,005
1,257,593	1,496	48,343	1,046,190	970,874	6,213,917
224,596	247	22,164	2,004	3,892,153
186,808	11,654	67,578	\$17,904	145,445	4,122,785

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE EXPRESS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE OPERATIONS

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TRANSPORTATION.		
	Express, Domestic.	Express, Foreign.	Miscellaneous.
	1	2	3
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$53,390,742	\$91,844	\$247,949
2 American Express Company.....	75,440,904	432,456	47,471
3 Southern Express Company.....	19,280,935	18,506	900
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	59,684,129	117,902	11,360

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN TRANSPORTATION—Continued.		
	C. O. D. Cheques.	Limited and Unlimited Cheques.	Travelers' Cheques.
	11	12	13
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$353,456	\$453	\$2,482
2 American Express Company.....	574,872	19,483	31,856
3 Southern Express Company.....	273,711	700
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	525,827	952	54,771

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 54.

REVENUE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE DISTRIBUTION THEREOF.

TRANSPORTATION—Continued.			OPERATIONS OTHER THAN TRANSPORTATION.			
Total Transportation.	Express Privileges, Dr.	Revenue from Transportation.	Customs Brokerage Fees.	Order and Commission.	Rents of Buildings and Property.	Money Orders.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
\$53,730,035	\$26,707,165	\$27,022,870	\$87,845	\$907	\$12,555	\$105,942
75,920,831	37,715,956	38,205,035	134,046	12,340	152,869	445,640
19,300,341	9,924,641	9,375,700	3,947	8,147	5,381	99,019
59,813,391	31,586,320	28,227,071	33,841	9,647	221,079	217,034

OPERATIONS OTHER THAN TRANSPORTATION—Continued.

Telegraph and Cable Transfers.	Letters of Credit.	Foreign Postal Remittances.	Profit on Exchange and Other Financial Revenue.	Miscellaneous.	Total Other Than Trans- portation.	Total Operating Revenue.
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
\$10	\$3,415	\$9,911	\$53,844	\$630,830	\$27,653,700
237,794	\$2,618	6,767	800,750	1,475,202	3,894,238	42,099,273
.....	53	4,900	395,746	9,771,447
10,312	51,538	226,266	1,351,269	29,578,340

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE EXPRESS CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE OPERATING

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	MAINTENANCE.			
	Superintendence.	Repairs of Buildings.	Depreciation and Retirement of Buildings.	Repairs of Cars.
	1	2	3	4
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$6,348	\$42,119	\$47,122
2 American Express Company.....	39,820	273,190	122,286	\$3,649
3 Southern Express Company.....	766	35,572	20,915
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	34,738	132,011	92,740	52,467

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	MAINTENANCE—Continued.				
	Repairs of Office Furniture and Equipment.	Depreciation and Retirement of Office Furniture and Equipment.	Repairs of Line Equipment.	Depreciation and Retirement of Line Equipment.	Miscellaneous Repairs.
	13	14	15	16	17
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$68,239	\$34,916	\$26,373	\$8,198	\$2,840
2 American Express Company.....	60,667	71,188	38,390	17,123	10,637
3 Southern Express Company.....	20,683	28,674	9,220	9,117	465
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	36,428	97,813	7,298	35,349	1,696

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TRANSPORTATION—Continued.				
	Commissions.	Office Supplies and Expenses.	Rent of Local Offices.	Vehicle Employees.	Stable and Garage Employees.
	26	27	28	29	30
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$1,562,872	\$636,506	\$772,293	\$4,616,360	\$487,686
2 American Express Company.....	2,853,592	988,584	1,216,009	5,521,180	548,207
3 Southern Express Company.....	1,202,636	186,226	225,129	508,860	36,351
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	2,749,891	580,628	822,650	3,626,377	358,415

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	GENERAL.				
	Salaries and Expenses, General Officers.	Salaries and Expenses, Clerks and Attendants.	General Office Supplies and Expenses.	Law Expenses.	Insurance and Fidelity Bond Premiums.
	39	40	41	42	43
1 Adams Express Company.....	\$105,422	\$778,133	\$59,378	\$99,850	\$120,300
2 American Express Company.....	153,058	1,232,911	314,727	100,910	1,484,519
3 Southern Express Company.....	71,512	460,064	20,761	39,439	28,140
4 Wells Fargo & Company.....	122,306	985,589	45,972	104,807	306,694

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

No. 55.

EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE DISTRIBUTION THEREOF.

MAINTENANCE—Continued.							
Depreciation and Retirement of Cars.	Repairs of Automobiles.	Depreciation and Retirement of Automobiles.	Repairs of Wagons, Sleighs and Harness.	Depreciation and Retirement of Wagons, Sleighs and Harness.	Depreciation and Retirement of Horses.	Repairs of Trucks.	Depreciation and Retirement of Trucks.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
.....	\$630,028	\$422,019	\$327,011	\$56,526	\$184,348	\$63,883	\$21,052
\$12,307	460,461	596,107	355,792	66,169	227,571	79,067	54,659
.....	42,847	32,869	63,363	17,455	14,903	35,015	13,681
37,521	121,509	88,404	333,703	95,064	216,602	68,421	33,245

MAINTENANCE—Continued.		TRAFFIC.				TRANSPORTATION.	
Miscellaneous Depreciation and Retirement.	Other Expenses.	Superintendence.	Advertising.	Stationery and Printing.	Other Expenses.	Superintendence.	Office Employees.
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
\$6,992	\$3,157	\$92,541	\$32,697	\$20,520	\$53	\$535,768	\$9,935,400
15,704	13	151,109	197,636	19,408	76	1,377,406	11,277,280
714	178	49,236	35,347	14,085	60	352,255	2,311,542
4,466	156,664	79,521	22,320	4	1,300,420	7,333,294

TRANSPORTATION—Continued.							
Stable and Garage Supplies and Expenses.	Drayage.	Train Employees.	Train Supplies and Expenses.	Stationery and Printing.	Loss and Damage.	Injuries to Persons.	Other Expenses.
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
\$2,236,014	\$1,529,062	\$1,374,565	\$37,124	\$598,353	\$2,644,388	\$111,566	\$38,879
2,600,446	1,604,061	2,206,123	198,997	684,308	2,988,959	119,179	170,334
325,450	124,990	955,826	23,405	241,205	515,809	34,519	11,097
1,906,241	700,015	2,232,019	111,268	667,017	2,250,227	171,485	25,778

GENERAL—Continued.		RECAPITULATION.					
Pensions.	Other Expenses.	Maintenance.	Traffic.	Transportation.	General.	Total Operating Expenses.	Ratio Operating Expenses to Operating Revenue.
44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51
\$59,329	\$40,662	\$1,951,175	\$145,811	\$27,116,836	\$1,263,074	\$30,476,896	110.21
171,287	146,203	2,504,801	368,228	34,354,665	3,603,615	40,831,309	96.99
8,750	40,920	346,439	98,728	7,055,300	669,587	8,170,054	83.61
64,692	183,760	1,489,477	258,510	24,835,725	1,813,820	28,397,532	98.91

TABLE No. 56.

THE PULLMAN COMPANY.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET—DECEMBER 31, 1917.

ASSETS:		ASSETS.	LIABILITIES.
INVESTMENTS:			
Cost of Property and Equipment.....		\$159,061,678	
Stocks Owned.....	\$1,762,580		
Funded Debt Owned.....	5,295,134	7,057,714	
Land Owned.....		6,651	
Total Investments.....		\$166,126,043	
CURRENT ASSETS:			
Cash.....	\$7,985,304		
Bills Receivable.....	227,206		
Due from Agents and Conductors.....	739,909		
Due from Solvent Co.'s and Individuals...	3,051,493		
Other Cash Assets.....	5,940,643		
Total Current Assets.....		17,944,555	
OTHER ASSETS:			
Equipment Trusts.....	\$6,511,943		
Materials and Supplies.....	6,459,872		
Sinking, Insurance and Other Funds.....	453,768		
Sundries.....	1,210,155		
Total Other Assets.....		14,635,733	
LIABILITIES:			
Capital Stock.....			\$120,000,000
CURRENT LIABILITIES:			
Audited Vouchers and Accounts.....		\$6,415,323	
Wages and Salaries.....		991,315	
Dividends not called for.....		20,080	
Miscellaneous.....		730,984	
Total Current Liabilities.....			8,157,702
OTHER LIABILITIES:			
Dividends accrued on Capital Stock.....			1,590,669
Depreciation on Cars.....		\$14,007,411	
Reserve for Accrued Depreciation on Equipment.....		34,165,911	
Reserve for Accrued Depreciation on Buildings, Etc.....		677,572	
Deferred Repairs.....		1,750,000	
Insurance and Other Reserve Funds.....		637,344	
Total Other Liabilities.....			51,238,238
PROFIT AND LOSS.....			17,719,722
GRAND TOTALS.....		\$198,706,331	\$198,706,331

TABLE No. 57.

THE PULLMAN COMPANY.

SHOWING THE INCOME ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR AND THE PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT ON
DECEMBER 31, 1917.

INCOME ACCOUNT.

OPERATING INCOME:

Sleeping Car Revenues	\$51,776,681	
Sleeping Car Expenses	<u>85,448,873</u>	
Net Sleeping Car Revenue		\$16,327,808
Net Revenue from Auxiliary Operations		<u>16,088</u>
Total Net Revenue		\$16,343,896
Taxes Accrued		<u>3,874,774</u>
Operating Income		\$12,469,122

OTHER INCOME:

Dividends on Stocks Owned	\$103,279	
Interest on Funded Debt Owned	143,931	
Interest on other Securities, Loans and Accounts	<u>695,110</u>	
Total Other Income		942,320
Gross Corporate Income		\$13,411,442

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME:

Hire of Equipment	\$5,245	
Interest	<u>328</u>	
Total Deductions		5,573
Net Corporate Income		\$13,405,869

DISPOSITION OF NET INCOME:

Dividends Declared	\$9,543,993	
Appropriations to Reserve	<u>.....</u>	9,543,993
Balance carried to credit of Profit and Loss		<u>\$3,861,876</u>

PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT:

Credit Balance January 1, 1917		\$12,631,307
Credit Balance from Income Account		3,861,876
Credit Balance from Manufacturing Plants		1,246,376
Unrefundable Overcharges		8,317
Miscellaneous Credits		<u>16,496</u>
Uncollectible Sleeping Car Revenue	\$722	
Miscellaneous Debits	<u>43,928</u>	
Balance Credit, carried to Balance Sheet	17,719,722	
Totals	\$17,764,372	\$17,764,372

TABLE No. 58.

THE PULLMAN COMPANY.

SHOWING THE OPERATING REVENUES AND THE AUXILIARY REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR
ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

OPERATING REVENUE:

	\$43,533,954	
	3,234,680	
	468	
	2,423,437	
	8,425	
	5,900,039	
	99,299	
n Rates.....	166,817	
ates.....	17,032	
Rates.....	16,856	
ies.....	68	
	212,246	
	21,100	
	64,183	
Car Mileage Revenue.....	698,207	
Association Revenue, Dr.....	162,032	
Contract Revenue, Dr.....	4,498,163	
Total Operating Revenue.....		\$51,776,681

AUXILIARY OPERATIONS:

REVENUE:

Dining and Special Car Revenue.....	\$23,751	
Sleeping and Parlor Car Commissarial Revenue.....	721,706	
Miscellaneous Revenue.....	17,925	
Total Operating Revenue.....		\$763,382

EXPENSES:

MAINTENANCE:

Repairs of Dining and Special Cars.....	\$45,772	
Depreciation of Dining and Special Cars.....	1,002	
Total Maintenance.....		46,764

CONDUCTING COMMISSARIAL SERVICE:

Superintendence.....	\$51,394	
Employee.....	141,072	
Fuel and Supplies.....	492,041	
Other Expenses.....	2,662	
Total Conducting Commissarial Service.....		687,169

GENERAL EXPENSES:

Administration.....	\$4,306	
Insurance.....	468	
Stationery and Printing.....	7,487	
Total General Expenses.....		12,261
Total Operating Expenses.....		\$746,294
Net Operating Revenue, Auxiliary Operations.....		\$16,088

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE No. 59.

THE PULLMAN COMPANY.

SHOWING THE OPERATING EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917, AND THE DISTRIBUTION THEREOF.

MAINTENANCE:

Superintendence.....	\$61,844	
Sleeping Car Repairs.....	9,474,774	
Parlor Car Repairs.....	1,388,008	
Other Car Repairs.....	278,987	
Sleeping Car Depreciation Adjustments.....	71,291	
Parlor Car Depreciation Adjustments.....	35,949	
Other Car Depreciation Adjustments.....	8,187	
Sleeping Car Depreciation.....	5,155,213	
Parlor Car Depreciation.....	772,929	
Other Car Depreciation.....	138,537	
Shop Machinery and Tools.....	34,311	
Buildings, Appurtenances and Grounds.....	121,530	
Buildings, Appurtenances and Grounds Depreciation.....	88,513	
Stationery and Printing.....	16,528	
Injuries to Persons.....	15,874	
Other Maintenance Expenses.....	33	
Maintenance of Association Cars, Cr.....	30,683	\$17,631,925

CONDUCTING CAR OPERATIONS:

Superintendence.....	\$300,816	
District Employees and Expenses.....	1,902,755	
Conductors.....	3,210,557	
Porters and Maids.....	3,493,303	
Car Cleaning.....	2,508,512	
Laundry.....	2,024,315	
Other Car Supplies and Expenses.....	2,221,838	
Stationery and Printing.....	159,401	
Loss and Damage.....	38,713	
Injuries to Persons.....	112,569	
Other Expenses.....	101,146	
Operation of Association Cars, Cr.....	27,059	16,046,866

GENERAL EXPENSES:

Salaries and Expenses of General Officers.....	\$249,966	
Salaries and Expenses of Clerks and Attendants.....	589,092	
General Office Supplies and Expenses.....	50,250	
Law Expenses.....	215,601	
Pension and Relief Expenses.....	179,486	
Insurance.....	68,009	
Stationery and Printing.....	48,379	
Other General Expenses.....	369,843	
Administration of Association Cars, Cr.....	545	1,770,081

RECAPITULATION:

Maintenance.....	\$17,631,925
Conducting Car Operations.....	16,046,866
General Expenses.....	1,770,081
Total Operating Expenses.....	\$35,448,872

Ratio of
Operating
Expenses to
Operating
Revenue,
68.46
Per Cent.

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items on this table are printed in bold type.

TABLE No. 60.

THE PULLMAN COMPANY.

SHOWING CERTAIN STATISTICS AND OPERATING REVENUE AND EXPENSE AVERAGES AND COMPARISONS

PASSENGERS:		
Standard Sleeping Cars.....	21,557,470	
Tourist Sleeping Cars.....	1,615,757	
Parlor Cars.....	8,891,516	
Composite Cars.....	195,754	
Miscellaneous.....	6	
Total, Revenue Passengers.....		32,260,503
Total, Non-Revenue Passengers.....		1,120,176
Average Number of Passengers, per car, per day.....		12
Average Revenue, per Passenger, Berth.....		\$2.45
Average Revenue, per Passenger, Seat.....		0.64
Sleeping Car Operations, Revenues:		
Revenues per Car-Mile.....	\$0.06641	
Revenues per Car-Day.....	21.69556	
Sleeping Car Operations, Expenses:		
Expenses per Car-Mile.....	0.04547	
Expenses per Car-Day.....	14.85385	
Net Revenue:		
Net Revenue per Car-Mile.....	0.02094	
Net Revenue per Car-Day.....	6.84171	
Total Number of Car-Days.....		2,386,510
Average Number of Car-Miles per Car-Day.....		326.66
Total Number of Car-Miles.....		779,572,930
Average Number of Car-Miles per mile of Trackage operated over.....		6,595.78
Average Capacity per Car—Passenger:		
Standard Sleeping Car, Berths.....		26.85
Tourist Sleeping Car, Berths.....		31.83
Parlor Car, Seats.....		30.74
Composite Car, Seats.....		26.77
EQUIPMENT:		
	Owned.	Leased.
Standard Sleeping Cars.....	5,441
Tourist Sleeping Cars.....	1,007
Parlor Cars.....	1,091
Dining Cars.....	4	1
Composite Cars.....	127	26
Private Cars.....	32
Miscellaneous Cars.....	4
Total in Service, all fitted with train brake and automatic coupler.....	7,706	27

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE AMOUNT OF ASSETS, THE AMOUNT OF

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	TOTALS.			
	ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.
	1	2	3	4
1 Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Co.....	\$695,596	\$19,019	\$413,056	\$11,158
2 Rock Creek Steamboat Co.....	11,622	*	13,250
3 Tolchester Beach Improvement Co.....	334,039	455	261,000
4 Woodall & Welch Freighting Co.....	15,450	15,450

TITLE OF CORPORATION.	DETAILS OF ASSETS—Continued.		
	Sinking Fund and Other Reserves.	Special Deposits and Prepayments.	Sundries.
	12	13	14
1 Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Co.....	\$50,932
2 Rock Creek Steamboat Co.....
3 Tolchester Beach Improvement Co.....
4 Woodall & Welch Freighting Co.....

NOTE—Deficit, loss and other reverse items in this table are printed in bold type.
* Denotes figures not furnished in report.

No. 61.

LIABILITIES AND THE SURPLUS ON DEC. 31, 1917, AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUCH ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.

TOTALS—Continued.						
SURPLUS OR DEFICIT.		DETAILS OF ASSETS.				
Total Amount December 31, 1917.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Real Property and Land Equipment.	Marine Equipment	Cash.	Bills and Accounts Receivable.	Materials and Supplies.
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
\$282,540	\$7,861	\$413,953	\$212,625	\$11,836	\$6,249
1,628	*	180	10,000	1,442
73,039	455	129,406	195,000	9,633
.....	12,000	3,400	\$50
DETAILS OF LIABILITIES.						
Capital Stock.	Funded Debt.	Bills and Accounts Payable.	Salaries and Wages Unpaid.	Interest, Dividends and Rents Accrued.	Sinking Fund and Other Reserves.	Sundries.
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
\$281,400	\$72,500	\$57,397	\$1,759
13,250
253,000	\$8,000
15,450

TABLE

SHOWING FOR EACH OF THE CORPORATIONS NAMED THEREIN THE GROSS INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES, THE

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		TOTALS.		
		Gross Income From All Sources.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Deductions From Gross Income.
		1	2	3
1	Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Co.....	\$426,424	*	\$415,613
2	Rock Creek Steamboat Co.....	6,923	*	6,923
3	Tolchester Beach Improvement Co.	220,403	*	219,947
4	Woodall & Welch Freighting Co.....	7,132	*	7,132

TITLE OF CORPORATION.		DETAILS OF INCOME—Cont.	DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME.	
		Miscellaneous.	Maintenance.	Towage and Lighterage.
		11	12	13
1	Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Co.....	\$3,654	\$24,937	\$3,473
2	Rock Creek Steamboat Co.....	630	642
3	Tolchester Beach Improvement Co.	64,323	26,617
4	Woodal & Welch Freighting Co.....	336

* Asterisk denotes figures not furnished.

No. 62.

DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME AND THE NET INCOME FROM THE OPERATIONS OF THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1917.

TOTALS—Continued.			DETAILS OF INCOME.			
Increase Over Preceding Year.	Surplus or Deficit.	Increase Over Preceding Year.	Passenger Traffic.	Freight Traffic.	Rents.	Interest and Dividends Received.
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
*	\$10,811	*	\$84,833	\$330,384	\$7,553
*	*	5,616	677
*	456	*	84,502	71,578
*	*	7,132

DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME—Continued.

Transporta- tion.	Tolls and Rents.	Interest on Funded and Other Debt.	Taxes.	Insurance.	Dividends.	Miscellaneous.
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
\$262,871	\$35,456	\$2,320	\$12,986	\$5,800	\$14,070	\$48,700
3,705	675	108	350	1,442
159,137	575	10,300	8,403	10,120	4,797
4,491	100	2,105	100

INDEX

	PAGE
Accidents, Railroad, Order 4548.....	414
American Express Co. vs. Guy M. Boller, et Al., Order 4317.....	157
American Railway Express Co., permission to increase rates 10 per cent., Order 4380.....	203
Annapolis Public Utilities Co. vs. John F. Martin, Order 4155.....	86
Anne Arundel, County Commissioners of, vs. O. L. Tunis, ferry at Camp Parole..	459
Annual Reports of Bridge Companies, Order 4268.....	132
Arlington Protective Association vs. Suburban Water Co., Order 4521.....	383
Arndt, John N., et Al., and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of sale, Order 4071.....	37
Artesian Water Co. vs. George S. Kemp, Order 4431.....	285
Vs. J. Cohen, Order 4421.....	224
Automobiles between Belair and Aberdeen, status of.....	454
Bagley, Cecil H. vs. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co., reparation claim, Order 4174.....	89
Baltimore & Bel Air Express Co. vs. Farmers' Co-Operative Co., Order 4525.....	383
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., permission to issue tariff on demurrage rates, Order 4110.....	59
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 819, Order 4038.....	32
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 934, Order 4038.....	43
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 866, Order 4094.....	48
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 938, Order 4106.....	54
Permission to issue passenger tariff No. 486, Order 4114.....	60
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 866, Order 4115.....	61
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 854, Order 4135.....	74
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 942, Order 4136.....	74
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 744, Order 4211.....	105
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 763, Order 4235.....	120
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 977, Order 4294.....	147
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 1025, Order 4299.....	148
Authority to issue mortgage bonds, Order 4095.....	45
Permission to issue general mortgage bonds, Order 4123.....	68
And Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Cecil H. Bagley, reparation claim, Order 4174.....	89
Permission to issue rate on bricks, Order 4284.....	144
Authority to issue bonds, Order 4372.....	199
Order 4382.....	204
And Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Louis Hamilton, reparation claim, Order 4499.....	373
Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co., permission to issue freight tariff No. 368, Order 4205.....	103
Freight siding at Rockawalkin, Order 4368.....	197
And Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. vs. commissioners of Hurlock, Order 4406.....	217
Baltimore County Water & Electric Co. vs. St. Agnes' Hospital, Order 4492.....	368
Authority to issue short term notes, Order 4498.....	371
Vs. Osborne I. Yellott, opinion.....	347
Order 4468.....	362
Vs. Daniel M. Henderson, Order 4448.....	294
Permission to change schedule and rates on metered water service, opinion..	226
Order 4425.....	274
Permission to change rates, Order 4281.....	142
Vs. Howard D. Gerhardt.....	464
Vs. W. M. Coulter.....	462

	PAGE
Baltimore Dry Docks & Shipbuilding Co. vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4098.....	51
Order 4148.....	81
Baltimore, Sparrows Point & Chesapeake Railway Co. and United Railways & Electric Co., approving contract with U. S. Shipping Board, Order 4504.....	375
Order 4535.....	392
Baltimore Transit Co., change of rates, Order 4528.....	387
Bel Air Electric Co. vs. Harry S. Carver, Order 4446.....	292
And Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4475.....	366
Bel Air Water & Light Co., permission to file rates, Order 4331.....	179
Berlin, Mayor and City Council of, and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4532.....	390
Bethlehem Steel Co. vs. Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. and Baltimore & Sparrows Point Railroad Co., reparation claim, Order 4120.....	65
Biddison, G. E., permission to discontinue auto truck service, Order 4131.....	72
Boller, Guy M., et Al., vs. American Express Co., Order 4317.....	157
Bounds, George C., & Co. and Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co., approval of sale, Order 4196.....	99
Bridge Companies, annual reports of, Order 4268.....	132
Brome's Wharf, jurisdiction of commission in matter of beer.....	449
Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co. vs. Mrs. Henry A. Lucas, Order 4543..	395
Burall, Irving A., permission to discontinue motor service, Order 4236.....	145
Cambridge Board of Trade vs. Diamond State Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4138.....	76
Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. vs. H. P. Geoghegan, Order 4408.....	218
Campbell, A. G., vs. Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co.....	457
Carlin, John J., Heating Co. vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order 4278.	139
Vs. Charles Kirwan, et Al., Order 4342.....	181
Carroll's Island Co. vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4141.....	78
Carver, Harry S., vs. Bel Air Electric Co., Order 4446.....	292
Cecil County, grade crossings, jurisdiction of commission.....	432
Cecilton Electric Light & Power Co., permit to issue stock and begin construction, Order 4354.....	189
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co. Approval of agreement.	
Order 4116.....	62
Order 4121.....	66
Order 4184.....	94
Order 4230.....	118
Order 4234.....	119
Order 4259.....	127
Order 4263.....	131
Order 4264.....	132
Order 4280.....	141
Order 4283.....	143
Order 4363.....	194
Order 4364.....	195
Order 4365.....	196
Order 4366.....	197
Order 4403.....	215
Order 4412.....	221
Order 4428.....	233
Order 4503.....	374
And John N. Arndt et Al., approval of sale, Order 4071.....	37
And Mayor and City Council, approval of agreement, Order 4088.....	43
And Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co., approval of agreement, Order 4089.....	44

Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.**Approval of agreement—Continued.**

And Maryland Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4109.....	59
Permission to issue toll rates for proving ground, Order 4119.....	64
Approval of agreement, Order 4124.....	69
Vs. George S. M. Kieffer et Al., order of consolidation, Order 4139.....	76
Vs. Roland Park Civic League, order of consolidation, Order 4140.....	77
Carroll's Island Co., order of consolidation, Order 4141.....	78
Richard A. Cole, order of consolidation, Order 4142.....	78
Vs. J. F. Juengst, order of consolidation, Order 4143.....	79
Frederick Board of Trade, order of consolidation, Order 4144.....	79
Joseph L. Donovan, order of consolidation, Order 4145.....	80
United States Auto Sales Co., order of consolidation, Order 4146.....	80
And Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, approval of agreement, Order 4172.....	88
And Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Co., approval of agreement, Order 4182..	92
And Western Union Telegraph Co., approval of agreement, Order 4183... Order 4206.....	98 108
Order 4223.....	114
Vs. C. C. Waters & Son, Order 4220.....	112
And Salisbury Light, Heat and Power Co., approval of agreement, Order 4242.....	121
And Trappe Electric Light Co., approval of agreement, Order 4301.....	151
And Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co., approval of agreement, Order 4325.....	178
Vs. William H. Stinson, Order 4397.....	211
And Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co., approval of agreement, Order 4429.....	284
Approving purchase of property of Maryland Telephone Co., Order 4434..	285
And Mayor and City Council of Berlin, approval of agreement, Order 4532.	390
And Consolidated Power Co., approval of agreement, Order 4533.....	391
And Joseph A. Ross, approval of agreement, Order 4473.....	365
And Bel Air Electric Co., approval of agreement, Order 4475.....	366
And Hillsboro Electric Light Co., approval of agreement, Order 4551.....	416
Order 4552.....	416
And Denton Drug Co., approval of agreement, Order 4553.....	417
And Western Union Telegraph Co., approval of agreement, Order 4556... Order 4563.....	419 421
Chestertown & Elkton Bus Line, permit to discontinue service, Order 4386.....	208
City & Suburban Railway of Washington, grade crossing.....	474
City Dairy Co. vs. Farmington Milk Truck Co., Order 4097.....	50
Cityco Realty Co., approval of rates, Order 4494.....	368
Close, C. P., in re interstate and intrastate tickets.....	437
Cochrane, The A. B. Co., et Al., vs. Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Co., increase in electric rates, Order 4549.....	414
Cohen, J., vs. Artesian Water Co., Order 4421.....	224
Cohill, S. R., et Al., vs. Northern Virginia Power Co., Order 4229.....	118
Cole, Richard A., vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4142.....	78
Collyer, R. N., agent, permission to issue supplement No. 25 to official classification No. 44, Order 4418.....	223
Permit to issue supplement to official classification No. 44, Order 4443....	291
Permission to issue supplement to official classification No. 44, Order 4463.	345
Order 4496.....	370
Order 4508.....	376
Order 4538.....	394
Order 4550.....	415
Common Carriers of Maryland, permission to publish tariffs on freight rates, Order 4215.....	108
Increase in freight rates, Order 4407.....	218

Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.**Approval of agreement.**

Order 4116.....	62
Order 4121.....	66
Order 4184.....	94
Order 4230.....	118
Order 4234.....	119
Order 4259.....	127
Order 4263.....	131
Order 4264.....	132
Order 4280.....	141
Order 4283.....	143
Order 4363.....	194
Order 4364.....	195
Order 4365.....	196
Order 4366.....	197
Order 4404.....	215
Order 4412.....	221
Order 4428.....	283
Order 4503.....	374
And Consolidated Power Co., approval of lease, Order 4079.....	41
Vs. Baltimore Dry Docks & Shipbuilding Co., Order 4098.....	51
Vs. Baltimore Dry Docks & Shipbuilding Co., Order 4148.....	81
Vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order 4150.....	82
And Consolidated Power Co., authority to issue notes, Order 4175.....	90
Permission to issue supplement to electric rates, Order 4200.....	100
Vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order 4244.....	122
Vs. Estate of William L. Stork, Order 4256.....	126
Vs. A. J. Oldenburg, Order 4297.....	148
Vs. J. A. Hughes, et Al., Order 4358.....	193
Permission to file electric rates, Order 4378.....	202
Vs. H. Ross Coppage, Order 4430.....	284
Vs. Elizabeth S. Hall, Order 4451.....	296
Vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland in re power rates, opinion...	297
Order 4452.....	338
Order 4452.....	340
Order 4465.....	346
Vs. Hess Steel Corporation, Order 4453.....	342
And Postal Telegraph Co., approval of agreement, Order 4470.....	364
Vs. John S. Fangmeyer, Order 4510.....	378
Application to increase price of gas, opinion.....	400
Order 4546.....	411
Consolidated Power Co. and Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., approval of lease, Order 4079.....	41
Authority to issue notes, Order 4175.....	90
And Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4538.....	391
Consumers' Ice Co., approving franchise and authority to issue capital stock, Order 4527.....	385
Coppage, H. Ross, vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4430..	284
Coulter, W. M., vs. Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	462
County roads, holes and ruts, jurisdiction of commission.....	440
Crisfield Ice Manufacturing Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4182.....	92
Vs. The A. B. Cochrane Co. et Al., increase in electric rates, Order 4549..	414
Cromwell, James H., vs. Maryland Electric Railways Co., Order 4316.....	156
Cumberland & Westernport Electric Railway Co., right to file rates.....	473
Curtis Bay Railroad Co., permission to publish tariff No. 3, Order 4541.....	395

	PAGE
Dantoni & Fertitta, permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4571.....	426
Delmar Water Co., authority to sell bonds, Order 4449.....	294
Denton Bus Co., permission to discontinue motor vehicle service, Order 4336.....	180
Denton Drug Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4553.....	417
Diamond State Telephone Co. vs. Cambridge Board of Trade, order of consolidation, Order 4138.....	76
Donovan, Joseph L., vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4145.....	80
Electric rates, withdrawal of, after filing.....	447
Elkton, Town Commissioners of, vs. Maryland Water Co., Order 4137.....	75
Order 4274.....	186
Order 4275.....	137
Order 4411.....	220
Elkton Water Works, Inc., approving franchise and authority to issue capital stock, Order 4457.....	342
Evergreen Lawn Land & Improvement Co., inquiry to discontinue business.....	438
Fait, John, vs. Glenburnie Light & Power Co., Order 4439.....	289
Fangmeyer, John S., vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4510.....	378
Farmers' Co-Operative Co. vs. Baltimore & Bel Air Express Co., Order 4525.....	383
Farmington Milk Truck Co. vs. City Dairy Co., Order 4097.....	50
Fast Freight Co., permit to operate motor vehicle, Order 4313.....	155
Fillingame, Harry B., and John S. Krastel, permit to operate motor vehicle, Order 4402.....	214
Fitzgerald, Dennis, vs. Northern Central Railway Co., Order 4133.....	73
Fitzsimmons, Michael J., vs. United Railways & Electric Co., Order 4445.....	291
Frederick Board of Trade vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4144.....	79
Geoghegan, H. P., vs. Cambridge Gas, Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4408....	218
Gerhardt, Howard D., vs. Baltimore County Water & Electric Co.....	464
Glenburnie Light & Power Co. vs. John Fait, Order 4439.....	289
Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co., permission to issue revised gas rates, Order 4151.....	83
Authority to issue bonds, Order 4282.....	142
Permission to issue freight tariff, Order 4370.....	198
Authority to issue bonds, Order 4375.....	200
And Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4429.....	284
Rate schedule No. 42, Order 4436.....	287
Vs. W. H. Z. King et Al., Order 4530.....	389
Vs. Mayor and City Council of Hagerstown, Order 4531.....	389
Increase of rates in Hagerstown.....	442
Validity of ordinance in re rate of fare.....	450
Hagerstown, Mayor and City Council of, vs. Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co., Order 4531.....	389
Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant, rate schedule No. 6, Order 4437.....	287
Hall, Elizabeth S., vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4451..	296
Hamilton, Louis, vs. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Pennsylvania Railroad Co., reparation claim, Order 4499.....	373
Harford County Commissioners, approving franchise with A. H. Morris et Al., Order 4509.....	377
Havre de Grace Gas Co. vs. Mayor and City Council of Havre de Grace, Order 4515.....	381
Vs. Havre de Grace Gas Co., Order 4515.....	381
Hawkins, Charles A., inquiry regarding individuals working without permission of Public Service Commission.....	439
Henderson, Daniel M., vs. Baltimore County Water & Electric Co., Order 4448....	294

	PAGE
Hess Steel Corporation vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4453.....	342
Highways Transfer Co., permit to discontinue motor vehicle freight service, Order 4464.....	345
Hillsboro Electric Light Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4551.....	416
Order 4552.....	416
Holes and ruts in county roads, jurisdiction of commission.....	440
Hopkins, Harry N., permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4076.....	40
Hughes, J. A., et Al., vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4358.....	193
Hurlock, Commissioners of, vs. Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co. and Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., Order 4406.....	217
Idlewylde Realty Co. vs. George W. King et Al., Order 4472.....	364
Inspection and examination of accounts of corporations, Order 4269.....	134
Inter-City Transfer Co., permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4570.....	425
Jessups & Moore Paper Co. vs. Washington Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway and Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., reparation claim, Order 4300.....	149
Juengst, J. F., vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4148.....	79
Keiffer, George S. M., et Al., vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4139.....	76
Kemp, George S., vs. Artesian Water Co., Order 4431.....	235
Kensington, Mayor and Town Council of, vs. Kensington Railway Co., Order 4567.....	423
Kensington Railway Co. vs. Mayor and Town Council of Kensington, Order 4567.....	423
Permission to increase rates, Order 4568.....	424
Killian, William H., et Al., vs. United Railways & Electric Co., Order 4495.....	369
King, George W., et Al., vs. Idlewylde Realty Co., Order 4472.....	364
King, W. H. Z., et Al., vs. Hagerstown & Frederick Railway Co., Order 4530.....	389
Kirwan, Charles, et Al., vs. John J. Carlin Heating Co., Order 4342.....	181
Krastel, John S., and Harry B. Fillingame, permit to operate motor vehicle, Order 4402.....	214
Lackey, James A., permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4569.....	425
Lakeland Improvement Association vs. United Railways & Electric Co., extension of Westport Line, Order 4519.....	381
Letteau, Charles G., permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4311.....	154
Liberty Heights Bus Co., permission to discontinue service, Order 4122.....	67
Lucas, Mrs. Henry A., vs. Brooklyn & Curtis Bay Light & Water Co., Order 4543.....	395
Mackall, William H., president Town Commissioners of Elkton, vs. Maryland Water Co., Order 4137.....	75
MacNeal, Walter F., & Co., in re jurisdiction of commission over Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	456
Martin, John F., vs. Annapolis Public Utilities Co., Order 4155.....	86
Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. vs. Cecil H. Bagley, reparation claim, Order 4174.....	89
Permission to file rates for discharged service men, Order 4555.....	418
Maryland, Delaware & Virginia Railway Co., approval of siding at Centreville, Order 4398.....	212
Maryland Electric Railways Co. vs. James H. Cromwell, Order 4316.....	156
And Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co., permission to make changes in tariff schedules, opinion.....	183
Order 4345.....	187
Order 4346.....	188
And United Railways & Electric Co., approving franchise of Anne Arundel County Commissioners, Order 4357.....	191

	PAGE
Maryland Motor Fast Freight Co., permission to issue capital stock, Order 4065...	35
Permission to discontinue business, Order 4529.....	388
Maryland Telephone Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4109.....	59
Maryland Utilities Co., authority to issue bonds, Order 4310.....	152
Authority to issue bonds and stock, Order 4526.....	384
Maryland Water Co. vs. Town Commissioners of Elkton, Order 4187.....	75
Vs. Town Commissioners of Elkton, Order 4274.....	186
Order 4275.....	187
Vs. Town Commissioners of Elkton, Order 4411.....	220
Vs. Town Commissioners.....	486
Mayor and City Council of Baltimore and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4172.....	88
Approving franchise to operate railroad, Order 4395.....	209
Morris, A. H., et Al., approving franchise with Harford County Commissioners, Order 4509.....	377
Motor Express Companies, jurisdiction of commission.....	433
Mountain Lake Park Association vs. Mountain Lake Water & Light Co., Order 4279.....	140
Mountain Lake Water & Light Co. vs. Mountain Lake Association, Order 4279....	140
Mt. Rainier, Mayor and City Council of, and Prince George's County Commissioners, authority to cross tracks at grade, Order 4565.....	422
Norfolk & Western Railway Co., permission to issue passenger tariff, Order 4062.	34
Northern Central Railway Co. vs. Dennis Fitzgerald, Order 4133.....	73
Northern Natural Gas Co., permission to change rates, Order 4187.....	95
Permission to change rates, Order 4245.....	123
Northern Virginia Power Co., Order 4228.....	117
Vs. S. R. Cohill et Al., Order 4229.....	118
Authority to issue bonds, Order 4318.....	157
Permission to file rate schedule No. 6, Order 4566.....	422
Nuisances, jurisdiction of commission.....	435
Oldenburg, A. J., vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4297...	148
Park School, reduced gas rate.....	473
Patapsco & Back River Railroad Co., approval of change of line, Order 4074....	40
Order 4107.....	55
Pearre, William H., permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4186.....	94
Peninsula Rapid Transit Co., permission to discontinue motor vehicle service, Order 4427.....	282
Pennsylvania Railroad Co., permission to issue freight tariff No. 156, Order 4039..	32
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 157, Order 4040.....	33
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 160, Order 4093.....	47
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 68, Order 4126.....	69
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 476, Order 4204.....	102
Permission to issue freight tariff Nos. 109 and 134, Order 4217.....	110
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 411, Order 4219.....	111
Permission to issue freight tariff, Order 4277.....	138
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 476, Order 4293.....	146
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 504, Order 4307.....	151
Permission to issue freight tariff in re coal, Order 4036.....	31
And Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., permission to issue stock, Order 4225.....	115
And Union Railroad Co., approval of lease, Order 4257.....	126
And Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis Electric Railway vs. Charles A. Smith Lumber Co. Inc., reparation claim, Order 4270.....	135
Vs. White Hall Farmers' Club and Improvement Association, Order 4312.	154
And Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. vs. Louis Hamilton, reparation claim. Order 4499.....	373
In re freight for United States Government at reduced rates.....	434

	PAGE
Peters, Thomas, Jr., vs. William J. Stull, et Al.....	463
Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. and Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Railway Co. vs. Tidewater Portland Cement Co., reparation claim, Order 4090.....	45
And Baltimore & Sparrows Point Railroad vs. Bethlehem Steel Co., reparation claim, Order 4120.....	65
Permission to issue bonds, Order 4224.....	113
And Pennsylvania Railroad Co., permission to issue stock, Order 4225...	115
And Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway vs. Jessups & Moore Paper Co., reparation claim, Order 4300.....	149
And Baltimore Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co. vs. Commissioners of Hurlock, Order 4406.....	217
And Baltimore & Sparrows Point Railroad Co., approving acquisition of property and franchise, Order 4592.....	427
Vs. A. G. Campbell.....	457
Pocomoke Bridge Co. in re free transportation of employees of State Department of Health.....	459
Postal Telegraph Co. and Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., approval of agreement, Order 4470.....	364
Potomac Electric Power Co., approving extension of lines in Mt. Rainier, Order 4593.....	428
Necessity of approval of commission for bond issue.....	456
Power term contracts, validity of.....	443
Prince George's County Commissioners and Mayor and City Council of Mt. Rainier, authority to cross tracks at grade, Order 4565.....	422
Public Service Commission of Maryland vs. United Railways & Electric Co., "Skip-Stop" plan, Order 4102.....	53
Order 4262.....	129
Vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4150.....	82
Vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4201.....	101
Vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4244.....	122
Vs. John J. Carlin Heating Co., Order 4278.....	139
Vs. United Railways & Electric Co., heating of cars, Order 4385.....	207
Vs. Commissioners of Thurmont, Order 4413.....	221
Vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., in re power rates, opinion.....	297
Order 4452.....	338
Order 4452.....	340
Order 4465.....	346
Vs. United Railways & Electric Co., increase in passenger rates, Order 4478.....	366
Order 4491.....	367
Vs. United Railways & Electric Co., increase in rates, Order 4547.....	413
In re appropriations.....	465
Public Service Corporations, form of approval of bond issues.....	451
Railroad accidents, Order 4548.....	414
Railroad and Steamship Lines, in re General Order No. 28, Director General of Railroads.....	441
Railroads of State, permission to issue freight tariff, Order 4070.....	36
Order 4072.....	39
Order 4108.....	56
Permission to revise rates and regulations governing reconsignment and diversion of carload traffic, Order 4117.....	62
Permission to change rates on petroleum, Order 4424.....	225
Roland Park Civic League vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4140.....	77
Ross, Joseph A., and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4473.....	365
Rossoff Motor Transportation Co., permit to operate motor freight vehicle, Order 4511.....	379

	PAGE
St. Agnes Hospital vs. Baltimore County Water & Electric Co., Order 4492.....	368
St. Michael's, Commissioners of, in re purchase of electric plant of Thomas E. Harrison et Al.....	461
Salisbury, Mayor and City Council of, vs. Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co., Order 4323.....	178
Opinion.....	159
Salisbury Light, Heat & Power Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4089.....	44
And George C. Bounds & Co., approval of sale, Order 4196.....	99
And Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4242.....	121
Vs. Mayor and City Council of Salisbury, Order 4323.....	178
Opinion.....	159
And Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4325.....	178
Pole line on Jersey road, Order 4344.....	182
Approval of franchise, Order 4409.....	219
Schwander, J. N., vs. Terminal Freezing & Heating Co., Order 4338.....	181
Segregation of white and colored passengers on Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway.....	452
Segregation of white and colored passengers on Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway.....	465
Sewerage companies, jurisdiction of commission.....	431
Smith, Charles A., Lumber Co., Inc., vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway, reparation claim, Order 4270...	185
Smith, Horace T., vs. United Railways & Electric Co., Order 4438.....	288
Southern Maryland Transit Co., permit to discontinue motor service, Order 4405..	217
Spessard, Harvey R., vs. Western Maryland Railway Co., Order 4105.....	54
Staley, William B., permission to operate motor vehicle, Order 4239.....	120
Steamboat landing at Tilghman, use of.....	442
Stewart, Charles E., and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4551.....	416
Order 4552.....	416
Stinson, William H., vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Order 4397.....	211
Stork, Estate of William L., vs. Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co., Order 4256.....	126
Stull, William J., et Al., vs. Thomas Peters, Jr.....	463
Suburban Water Co., permission to file supplement to rate schedule, Order 4520...	382
Vs. Arlington Protective Association, Order 4521.....	383
Sudbrook Park Development Co. vs. Sudbrook Park Improvement Association, Order 4212.....	106
Order 4514.....	380
Sudbrook Park Improvement Association vs. Sudbrook Park Development Co., Order 4212.....	106
Order 4514.....	380
Susquehanna Transmission Co., authority to issue mortgage bonds, Order 4560....	419
Terminal Heating & Freezing Co. vs. J. N. Schwander, Order 4338.....	181
Thurmont, Commissioners of, vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, Order 4418.....	221
Tidewater Portland Cement Co. vs. Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. and Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railway Co., reparation claim, Order 4090.....	45
Tilghman, use of steamboat landing.....	442
Tolchester Beach Improvement Co., permission to issue freight tariffs Nos. 38, 39, 40 and 41, Order 4260.....	128
Permission to issue freight tariffs Nos. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, Order 4285.....	145
Permission to file tariff No. 46, Order 4545.....	399

	PAGE
Towson & Cedarcroft Bus Co., permit to operate motor vehicle, Order 4422.....	224
Trappe Electric Light Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4301.....	151
Permit to exercise franchise, Order 4404.....	216
Authority to issue stock, Order 4450.....	295
Travers, Jesse E., permit to operate motor vehicle, Order 4351.....	188
Tunis, O. L., vs. County Commissioners of Anne Arundel, ferry at Camp Parole..	459
Union Railroad Co. and Pennsylvania Railroad Co., approval of lease, Order 4257.	126
United Railways & Electric Co., investigation of regulations and equipment, Order 4152.....	84
Order 4156.....	87
Vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, "Skip-Stop" plan, Order 4102.....	53
Order 4262.....	129
Approving franchise of Anne Arundel County Commissioners, Order 4356.	190
Approving franchise of Anne Arundel County Commissioners, Order 4357.	191
Approval of franchise, Order 4377.....	201
Approval of removing tracks on Light Street, Order 4384.....	206
Vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, heating of cars, Order 4385.	207
Approving permit to lease cars to United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Order 4396.....	210
Vs. Horace T. Smith, Order 4438.....	288
Vs. Michael J. Fitzsimmons, Order 4445.....	291
Approval of purchase of new cars, Order 4447.....	293
Vs. Public Service Commission of Maryland, increase in passenger rates, Order 4478.....	366
Order 4491.....	367
Vs. William H. Killian et Al., Order 4495.....	369
Vs. Lakeland Improvement Association extension of Westport line, Order 4519.....	381
And Baltimore, Sparrows Point & Chesapeake Railway Co., approving contract with United States Shipping Board, Order 4504.....	375
Order 4535.....	392
Increased passenger rates.....	467
Receipt slips for excess fare.....	467
Fare zones in new city limits.....	475
United States Auto Sales Co. vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., order of consolidation, Order 4146.....	80
United States Fuel Administration, recommendation, Order 4322.....	159
Order 4338.....	180
"Stagger-Stop," Order 4400.....	213
"Stagger-Stop," Order 4441.....	290
Unpaid bills, jurisdiction of commission.....	437
Washington & Rockville Railway, injunction proceedings.....	475
Commutation rates.....	469
Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Railway Co., approval of bonds, Order 4194..	97
And Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Charles A. Smith Lumber Co., Inc., reparation claim, Order 4270.....	135
And Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. vs. Jessups & Moore Paper Co., reparation claim, Order 4300.....	149
And Maryland Electric Railways Co., permission to make changes in tariff schedules, opinion.....	183
Order 4345.....	187
Order 4346.....	188
Improper treatment of citizen by employees.....	448
Segregation of white and colored passengers.....	452
Excessive whistle blowing.....	469

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

663

	PAGE
Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad, approving franchise and permit to issue stocks and bonds, Order 4383.....	205
Washington County Railroad Co., authority to issue bonds, Order 4096.....	49
Washington County Water Co., valuation of plant, Order 4209.....	104
Order 4214.....	107
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, authority to issue bonds, Order 4416.	222
Waters, C. C., & Son, vs. Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Order 4220.....	112
Western Maryland Railway Co. vs. Harvey R. Spessard, Order 4105.....	54
Permission to issue tariff on demurrage rates, Order 4110.....	59
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 782, Order 4090.....	52
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 782, Order 4118.....	63
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 862, Order 4127.....	70
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 863, Order 4128.....	71
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 813, Order 4129.....	72
Permission to issue freight tariff No. 867, Order 4227.....	116
Western Union Telegraph Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4183.....	93
Order 4206.....	103
Order 4223.....	114
Permission to dispose of worn-out property, Order 4544.....	396
And Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., approval of agreement, Order 4556.....	419
Order 4563.....	421
West Virginia & Maryland Gas Co., permission to change rates, Order 4188.....	96
Order 4189.....	96
Permission to change rates, Order 4246.....	124
Order 4247.....	125
White Hall Farmers' Club & Improvement Association vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Order 4312.....	154
Yellott, Osborne L., vs. Baltimore County Water & Electric Co., opinion.....	347
Order 4468.....	362
Young, E. M., permit to operate motor vehicle, Order 4399.....	212

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below.

